NOTE TO USERS

Page(s) not included in the original manuscript are unavailable from the author or university. The manuscript was microfilmed as received.

9,61

This reproduction is the best copy available

UMI

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

DUETTING: THE EFFECTS OF POLITENESS ON NARRATIVE TURN-TAKING

BY

IAN W. WALLACE

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

in

Psycholinguistics

DEPARTMENT OF LINGUISTICS

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

Fall, 1999

National Library of Canada
Acquisitions and Bibliographic Services
395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Acquisitions et services bibliographiques
395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-47110-1

Canada

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: Ian W. Wallace

TITLE OF THESIS: Duetting: The Effects of Politeness on Narrative Turn-Taking

DEGREE: Master of Science

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED: 1999

Permission is hereby granted to the University of Alberta Library to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly, or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves all other publication and other rights in association with the copyright of the thesis, and except as hereinbefore provided, neither the thesis nor any substantial portion thereof may be printed or otherwise reproduced in any material form whatever without the author's prior written permission.

Ian W. Wallace
#10, 11233-124 St.
Edmonton, Alberta
Canada T5M 0J9

18 August 1999
Date

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled **Duetting: The Effects of Politeness on Narrative Turn-Taking** submitted by Ian W. Wallace in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science in Psycholinguistics.

Dr. Gary D. Prideaux, Supervisor

Dr. Lois M. Stanford, Chair

Dr. Ann Penningroth, External

10 August 1999

Date

Abstract

This study is, to the author's knowledge, the first known experimental investigation into the style of narrative production known as duetting. Duetting occurs when two people who have both witnessed an event, relate that event together to a third person. In this study, duetting was investigated from the perspective of politeness. The central research question to be addressed was, to what extent does the level of familiarity between duetting speakers constrain the level of politeness in their language? Politeness level was measured by the number of hedges, interruptions and overlaps in speech, overt politeness markers used, and the lengths of narratives produced. It was found that duetting strangers tend to use more hedges and fewer interruptions, and produce shorter narratives, than did duetting couples who were married or lived together. These results show that familiarity decreases the level of politeness used by speakers in a conversational duet.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisor, Dr. Gary D. Prideaux for his unending support and guidance. As my supervisor, he gave me focus, motivation, support, and lots of help. If it were not for him I would still be trying to figure out where to start. He has been exceptionally generous, providing me with both work and a computer to use. He has taught me a great deal about linguistics and about life. I will be forever grateful for his help.

I would like to thank the remainder of the academic staff of the Department of Linguistics for their kind words, support, and help with this and the other projects I have been working on.

I want to thank all of the members of the Discourse Research Group and the attendees of the Alberta Linguistics Association Conference 1998 for providing me with a forum to review thoughts and ideas. A fresh perspective is essential for any work to progress.

Thank you Mary and Dianne for helping me with my experimental materials as well as with all of the various administrative details I could not handle on my own.

A big thanks goes out to all of the students, friends, and family who acted as participants in this study. This kind of work would never get done if you were not willing to give up your free (or not so free) time.

I would especially like to thank Susanne Mutter, she has been a fountain of unending love and support. I would not have survived this past year so easily without having her to comfort me and reassure me.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction & Literature Review..... 1

1.0 Introduction..... 1

1.1 Duetting..... 2

1.2 Politeness..... 5

Chapter 2: A Psycholinguistic Perspective..... 11

2.0 Introduction..... 11

2.1 Motivation..... 11

2.2 Politeness in Duetting..... 12

2.3 Summary..... 16

Chapter 3: Methodology..... 17

3.0 Introduction..... 17

3.1 Subjects..... 18

3.2 Procedure..... 18

3.2.1 The Pilot Study..... 19

3.2.2 The Main Study..... 21

3.2.3 Follow-Up Questionnaire..... 22

3.3 Analysis..... 23

3.3.1 Transcription..... 23

3.3.2 Scoring..... 23

3.3.3 Post-Study Questionnaire..... 25

Chapter 4: Results..... 26

4.0 Introduction..... 26

4.1 Transcription Analysis and Scoring..... 26

4.1.1 Interruptions..... 26

4.1.2 Overt Politeness Markers..... 31

4.1.3 Hedges..... 31

4.1.4 Length of Utterance..... 33
4.2 Post-Study Questionnaire..... 36
4.2.1 Dominance..... 36
4.2.2 Interruptions..... 37
4.2.3 Verbosity..... 38
4.3 Summary..... 40

Chapter 5: Discussion and Conclusions..... 41
5.0 Introduction..... 41
5.1 The Goals Revisited..... 41
5.2 The Goals Achieved..... 42
5.3 Cautionary Remarks..... 45
5.4 Conclusions and Implications for the Future..... 45

References..... 48

Appendix A - Transcript of Pilot Couple 1..... 51
Appendix B - Transcript of Pilot Couple 2..... 52
Appendix C - Instructions..... 55
Appendix D - Post-Study Questionnaire..... 56
Appendix E - Transcriptions of Couples Group..... 57
Appendix F - Transcriptions of Strangers Group..... 90

List of Tables

Table 1. Number of interruptions and overlaps in speech..... 27

Table 2. *t*-test of Number of interruptions (including overlaps) 27

Table 3. *t*-tests on number of interruptions (without overlaps) and overlaps..... 28

Table 4. Number of interruptions per number of turns..... 28

Table 5. *t*-test of number of interruptions per turn..... 29

Table 6. Percentage of interruptions occurring at clause boundaries..... 30

Table 7. *t*-test of interruptions at clause boundaries per total interruptions..... 31

Table 8. Number of hedges used..... 32

Table 9. *t*-test of number of hedges used..... 33

Table 10. *t*-test of number of hedges per word..... 33

Table 11. Overall length of narratives and MLU..... 34

Table 12. *t*-test of MLUs between the two groups..... 34

Table 13. *t*-test of number of words used per narrative..... 35

Table 14. *t*-test of number of turns exchanged by speakers in each narrative..... 35

Table 15. *t*-test of the number of turns taken compared to the overall length of the narrative..... 36

Table 16. Did you dominate the conversation?..... 37

Table 17. Were you interrupted?..... 37

Table 18. Were you bothered?..... 38

Table 19. Are you quiet with friends? 39

Table 20. Are you quiet with strangers? 40

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.0 Introduction

Discourse analysis is the study and analysis of language in use (Brown & Yule, 1983). When people use language, many different factors influence how they communicate information or tell stories. Some of these factors include setting, number of listeners, who the listeners are, and what the desired effect of the communication is. This paper describes an analysis of one method of telling stories, and the factors that contribute to its unique style. This type of narrative production is called duetting.

Duetting is a style of narrative production in which two people tell the story to a third person of an event that both of them have witnessed or experienced. This is different from typical conversation in that the two participants are speaking cooperatively. In essence, they are speaking as one voice. Duetting is a unique mixture of conversation and narrative production, and investigation into this area should bridge the gap between these two components of discourse analysis.

This paper will outline an analysis of duetting and will discuss the effects of politeness on the conversational duet as determined by the strength of the relationship between the duet members. This study is important for several reasons. The first is that this is the first known experimental study dealing specifically with duetting. Any theory or model that attempts to describe human behavior should be tested experimentally, and this represents my attempt to do this. The second reason is that duetting is an extremely common phenomenon. It occurs quite often, but has not as yet been addressed empirically to any extent.

The remainder of chapter one will deal with some of the theoretical issues surrounding duetting and conversation. In section 1.2 politeness will also be discussed, with reference to its role as a major variable in the study. In chapter two, these issues will be discussed with reference to the design of the current study. In chapter three, the methodology, including procedure and analysis of the data, will be addressed. The fourth chapter will deal with the results from the analyses and the fifth chapter will present the conclusions from this study and a brief discussion of this work.

1.1 Duetting

Although duetting is not a new phenomenon, it did not appear in the literature of discourse analysis until Jane Falk's 1979 dissertation, *The duet as a conversational process.* There, she defined a duet and outlined the criteria for, and characteristics of, duetting. It is important to note that Falk typically uses the term *duet* to describe small, sometimes isolated, incidents of overlapping or cooperative speech in conversation. For the current analysis however, *duet* will be used to describe the entire narrative produced by two people speaking cooperatively.

Falk's criteria or prerequisites for duetting are threefold. The first of these can be captured under the aegis of "mutual knowledge". Each member of the duet must have the same background information in order to speak on the other's behalf. Falk (1979) makes a distinction between shared knowledge and mutual knowledge, choosing the broader category of mutual knowledge. The reason for this decision is that knowledge of a topic need not be completely shared. It need only be similar for two people to be able to speak on the topic, though it can also be shared. For example, if two people both witnessed an

accident, they both have mutual knowledge of the accident, and can then provide an accurate account to the police. They may not have exactly shared knowledge however, if they were each standing on opposite sides of the street when the accident happened. Clark (1992) states that speakers must also know that the other participants in a conversation, or in this case a duet, have this same mutual knowledge; something which he calls "common ground".

The second criterion of a duet is that of relative authority. The level of mutual knowledge between the members of a duet must be approximately the same; otherwise the effects of dominance interfere with the members speaking as one. For example, a full professor of physics and a student taking an introductory course in physics do not have the same authority to answer the question "What is relativity?" In a situation in which both of them were asked to answer this question together, the professor would most likely dominate the discussion, thereby eliminating the cooperative nature of the duet. However, two people who both witnessed an accident, for example, do have the same relative authority to explain what happened to the police, assuming neither is an insurance agent or police officer.

The third criterion for duetting as outlined in Falk's 1979 dissertation is that of camaraderie. Camaraderie provides the motivation to initiate and maintain a duet. Quite simply, there are few naturally occurring circumstances that would entice two complete strangers to begin duetting. Camaraderie is also a major variable in the current study. Duetting will be investigated through a comparison of the narrative turn-taking styles of couples, married or living together with those of complete strangers.

Jane Falk in her 1980 paper introduced three further criteria which compose a duet. The first of these additional criteria is that members of the duet must have a shared goal of communication. This too contributes to the motivation to engage in duetting. One is not likely to tell a story, alone or with someone else, if that person doesn't want to tell the story. The shared goal of communication also feeds the joint participation that is so characteristic of the duet. That is, the way members of a duet speak in tandem, picking up where the other left off, and not just taking turns. The interruptions and interjections that facilitate this are necessary for each member to ensure that the other is providing as much information as is necessary or possible, that is, as much information as that person would give if it was his/her turn to speak.

The second of the new criteria was actually listed as a characteristic of duetting in Falk's 1979 paper. It states that the members of a duet are not talking to each other but to a mutual audience (Falk 1980). This manifests itself in a parallel body position such that the two speakers are facing the hearer rather than each other, as would be found in a typical example of one-on-one conversation.

The final criterion is also important to the overall picture of the duet. Each of the members' contributions counts on both of their behalves (Falk, 1980). In other words, when a couple is engaged in a duet they are essentially speaking as one person. The tandem nature of the narrative production that is so characteristic is essentially an ongoing process to ensure that the whole picture, as composed by both speakers, is being relayed.

All of these criteria form a matrix which defines the conversational duet. They are all connected, so the removal or manipulation of one should influence the others, thereby

excluding a given discourse from membership in the category of duet. For example, if there is no mutual knowledge held between the duet members, they do not have the same authority to discuss the event; one person's contribution then can't count on both their behalves, and thus they are no longer speaking as one person.

Duetting is viewed by Chafe (1997) as very similar to Falk's interpretation, except that he sees duetting not as a result of a shared task of communication, but a result of speakers' different ways of developing topics. He even gives the phenomenon a different name to capture this idea, "polyphonic topic development". Simply, duetting is a type of narrative production with some properties that are different from single person narrative production.

Duetting then is "the constantly changing foci of consciousness verbalized by the several interlocutors" (Chafe, 1997: 49). This means that, like typical speaker/hearer conversation, participants use intonation cues, among other things, to signal the completion of a focus of consciousness. A focus is essentially an intonation unit, usually a simple phrase or clause, which contains a small amount of information currently active in the mind of the speaker (Chafe, 1994). Unlike typical conversation however, the duet is much more dynamic in that there is more cooperation by the speakers with each other, manifested primarily in overlapping speech and interruptions. It should be noted however, that these conclusions, like Falk's, were drawn using only a single sample of a narrative formed by duetting.

Other researchers have investigated duetting (Norrick, 1993, 1998; Michaels & Cook-Gumperz, 1979; Schlegoff, 1992), though from different perspectives than the previous examples and the one discussed in this paper. Watson (1975), Boggs (1985), and

Goodwin (1986) investigated the impact of multiple tellers on the trajectory of narrative. They also looked at the effects of different interest and competence in the details of the stories. Tannen (1978) investigated how differing opinions as to what constitutes a story can lead to dissonance between the narrative producers. The foci of the above mentioned papers differed in many ways from the current study, which places a greater emphasis on the speakers than on the story.

1.2 Politeness

A critical aspect to the analysis of the present study is the notion of politeness. As mentioned above, camaraderie plays a major role in the duetting phenomenon, and camaraderie also affects the amount of politeness that is required in communication. The closer the relationship that exists between the speakers, the less politeness is needed to negotiate turn taking or length of utterance. The closer the relationship, the less is needed of elaborated, overt politeness. Accordingly, in the present study, two groups with different levels of camaraderie were tested, under the assumption that the varying levels of camaraderie would in turn vary the level of politeness required by the speakers. This interaction of politeness and camaraderie is expected to be a major factor in the amount of duetting type behavior (chapter 2) exhibited by the participants.

There have been several approaches to the study of politeness in the past. One important one is the 'social-norm view' (Fraser, 1990), which states that society has a set of rules that prescribe behavior in certain situations. Politeness arises when actions are in accord with these rules, and impoliteness or rudeness occurs when these rules are violated. This particular view is somewhat dated in that it reflects prescriptive notions

such as used to be found in books of etiquette. It might in fact be argued that such prescriptions in those books are just an attempt to formalize social values present in the society.

A second perspective on the study of politeness comes from the Gricean maxims of conversation (Grice, 1975). These maxims are a list of guidelines that speakers should adhere to when engaged in conversation. Politeness was not included among the four main maxims of conversation (quality, quantity, relation, and manner), but rather was cited as a maxim on its own. The first four maxims refer to the structure and flow of conversation, whereas the politeness maxim is more of an aesthetic, social, or moral maxim. Later, Lakoff (1973) used these maxims in an attempt to account for politeness. Lakoff views politeness as an avoidance of offense, and in fact primary to the goal of communicating information. She posited two rules of pragmatic competence. The first of these was 'Be Clear', which was essentially Grice's four maxims of conversation collapsed into one. A notion which in itself, demonstrates the importance placed on politeness[1]. The second maxim was 'Be Polite', and it was composed of three sub-rules which are to be used when different levels of politeness are required:

1. Don't impose (formal/impersonal politeness)
2. Give options (informal politeness)
3. Make X feel good (intimate politeness)

So, in a more intimate setting, with someone very familiar, it would be more acceptable to say, "Shut the window" than it would be to say, "Please shut the window". This is

[1] Sperber and Wilson (1986) also collapsed Grice's four maxims into one maxim, be relevant. However, their motivation for doing this was psychologically based rather than socio-culturally like Lakoff's. To them, the pragmatic nature of the maxims would place them in a single module of the mind distinct from semantics and the like.

because the excess politeness created by the *please* might cause the hearer to assume that the speaker and listener are no longer in a state of strong camaraderie. However, in a less formal setting, it may be more polite to say "It's cold in here", giving the hearer the option of shutting the window or not.

One of the most commonly cited views of politeness is Brown and Levinson's face-saving theory, first published in 1978. They claim that politeness is a redressive action taken to counterbalance the disruptive effect of face-threatening acts (Brown & Levinson, 1987). In other words, every person has a self-image and self-esteem, called 'face'. Politeness is a set of linguistic strategies used by speakers to maintain the hearer's and the speaker's own face. Face includes an individual's desire to be approved of (positive face), and an individual's right to act without disruption from others (negative face) (Meier, 1990). A face-threatening act, then, is any act which interrupts or interferes with a person's face, be it positive or negative face. The following are some examples of face-threatening acts for both speakers and hearers (Fraser, 1990):

1. Hearer's Negative Face: ordering, advising, threatening, warning
2. Hearer's Positive Face: complaining, criticizing, raising taboo topics
3. Speaker's Negative Face: accepting thanks, promising unwillingly
4. Speaker's Positive Face: apologizing, accepting compliments

The seriousness of a fact-threatening act is determined by the weighting of three culturally motivated variables. The first of these is Social Distance, or the degree of familiarity between the speaker and hearer. According to Brown and Levinson (1987), this is based on a frequency measurement of the interaction between the speaker and hearer, and based on the kinds of information that are exchanged. So the more often two

NOTE TO USERS

Page(s) not included in the original manuscript are unavailable from the author or university. The manuscript was microfilmed as received.

9

This reproduction is the best copy available

UMI

All of these theories of politeness overlap to some degree. Whether saving face or abiding by a contract, what is common to all of these theories is that politeness is viewed as navigating a conversation through channels of individual expectations and culturally specific norms. The differences lie in the details. In the conversational maxim theory, politeness is a tactic used to avoid offense in conversation, and thereby make the transfer of information more pleasing. Every act is carefully chosen so as to not offend the hearer or bring shame upon the speaker. In the face-saving theory, politeness is seen as a tally of acts that either contribute to, or take away from, a person's face. These acts carry with them certain weightings of acceptability, and the use of them changes face in varying degrees. In the conversational contract theory, politeness levels are determined on a case-by-case basis. An act is acceptable if it falls within the guidelines set up at the outset of the conversation.

In the next chapter, I will show how the concepts discussed above were operationalized for use in the design and analysis of this empirical study of duetting and politeness. Specifically, I will outline what indicators of politeness were used in the final analysis of the data, and I will discuss what aspects of Falk's duetting criteria were used and manipulated for the purpose of testing them.

Chapter 2 - A Psycholinguistic Perspective

2.0 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to outline how many of the concepts presented in the first chapter can be operationalized into a useful framework within which duetting can be explored experimentally. It should be noted again that the term duetting, for the purposes of this study, is not used to only refer to isolated instances of overlapping or cooperative speech, but rather to the whole discourse produced by two people telling a story cooperatively. To be discussed in section 2.1 are the motivations for this study. In section 2.2 an explanation of the items used tc characterize politeness, or a lack thereof, is given, and finally in section 2.3, a brief explanation is presented of how these items were used in the analysis of the data.

2.1 Motivation

A critical fault with Falk's (1980) and Chafe's (1997) analysis of duetting is that these researchers based their conclusions on the analyses of single conversations. Though it may be useful to use limited data sets for a preliminary analysis and to begin the development of a theory, it is imperative that aspects of that theory be tested under experimental conditions. The reason for this is to ensure that as many variables as possible are controlled for. If certain variables are not controlled, it is impossible to determine whether the results of a study are due to any one specific factor or a number of different factors. This study is an attempt to control the practice of duetting in order to determine what effects the variable of politeness has on the behavior of the speakers and the subsequent discourse they produce.

Of the six criteria involved in the analysis of duetting mentioned in chapter one, the one that was manipulated for the purpose of testing it was camaraderie. Camaraderie, as argued in the previous chapter, has a strong influence on politeness. A previous, good relationship between members of a duet is an integral component, according to Falk (1979), to the production of a duet. What would happen then if two strangers were brought together to tell a story? Would their lack of camaraderie affect the structure of the narrative that they produce? It is expected that the degree of camaraderie will affect the structure of the duet such that the strangers will produce fewer interruptions and overlaps, shorter narratives, longer utterances, and a greater number of hedges. This is expected because the degree of politeness between strangers is greater than between intimate couples.

2.2 Politeness in Duetting

In Schiffrin's discussion about "speaking for another" (1994, p. 109), alignments in speech can be seen as either chipping in or butting in, depending on the interpretation of the act by the other speaker or by the hearer. If the interpretation of the act is seen in a positive light, then the interruption or overlap of speech is seen as the more positive chipping in. But, if the act is seen as negative, something which gets in the way of a person's right to speak and involving negative face, then the act is seen as butting in. This view of interruption as either an aiding or an impeding device is supported by Brown and Levinson (1987) and Goffman (1967). It is difficult, if not impossible, to objectively identify which of these are in use for a given interruption. So for the purposes of this study, interruptions made by speakers in the strangers group will be considered butting

in, whereas interruptions made by couples will be taken as chipping in. For this reason, the number of overlaps and interruptions in speech were counted.

The expected result of this particular analysis was that there would be more interruptions (and overlaps) in the couples' duets, in comparison to the strangers' duets. This was expected because the interruptions are seen as the more positive chipping in among the couples. Interruption is a face threatening act (FTA). However, it is one of the few FTAs that threatens both the hearer's negative face (the hearer's freedom of action), and the hearer's positive face (the hearer's feelings, wants, etc.) (Brown & Yule, 1987, p. 67) Therefore, the polite strategy of a speaker would be to avoid these acts. If the politeness level of a pair of speakers is low, as in the couples group, then the expected amount of negative FTAs, in this case interruptions, would be higher, and the interpretation of these acts would be more positive. However, if the level of politeness is higher, as in the strangers group, then the expected occurrence of interruptions should be lower, and their interpretation would be negative.

As well as determining the frequency of interruptions, the nature of the interruptions, specifically where they tend to occur, was also investigated. When there are interruptions in the strangers' duet, they are more often expected to occur at clause boundaries. This is because it seems more polite to interrupt when the other speaker is perceived to have completed his or her thought, thus giving up a turn. This notion is central to Sacks et al. (1974) 'rules governing turn construction'. There are several types of units like clauses, sentences, phrases, etc., which indicate 'transition-relevant places' (TRPs) where turn-changes could occur. Included within the construction of a turn are projections of these units and their possible completion points (Schiffrin, 1994, p. 328).

When presented with emerging discourse, the hearer immediately posits possible completion points of TRPs to begin his or her own turn. Since there exists less politeness with the couples, and therefore less accordance with the rules governing turn construction, fewer interruptions at clause boundaries and other TRPs, as a function of the total number of interruptions, are expected to be found in this group.

Other markers were used in the study as indicators of politeness. The first of these were overt politeness markers. These are words like *please*, or phrases like *thank you* or *excuse me*. It is expected that there would be fewer of these in the couples' duets. According to Brown and Levinson (1987), these overt politeness markers are a part of negative politeness, which represents the greater part of North American politeness strategies. Negative politeness is a strategy used to minimize the effects of impositions, and thereby avoid the appearance of impeding on the hearer's freedom of action. It is expected that there will be fewer overt politeness markers in the duets produced by speakers in the couples group.

Another group of markers that was used in the analysis was hedges. These are particles, words, or phrases that represent the illocutionary force of a sentence (Brown & Levinson, 1987). One of the more common types of hedges used for the purpose of 'softening' an assertion or order, are tag questions. In the case of softening an assertion, the tag serves to prevent the speaker from imposing power over the hearer by including the hearer in the assertion. The following is an example of this (with the tag in italics):

1. That was an excellent movie, *wasn't it*?

In the case of softening an order or request, the tag gives the hearer the option of performing the desired act or not, again preventing the speaker from asserting too much power. The following is an example of this:

2. Open the window, *would you*?

It is expected that the strangers will use a greater number of hedges, specifically tag questions, than the couples. Other hedges that will be included are phrases like *it looked like* or *kind of*. These, and others like them, are phrases that presume the possibility of error, thereby maintaining the face of the speaker.

The length of utterances and length of the narratives will also be used as measures of politeness. It is expected that politeness will impact the average length of utterance between the two groups. As stated above, since it is considered impolite to interrupt another speaker in North American culture, it is expected that the mean length of utterance of members in the strangers group, as measured by the number of words per turn, will be greater than that in the couples group. Strangers are expected to allow the other speaker to continue talking for a longer period of time for fear that interrupting would be viewed as impolite.

It is also expected that the entire lengths of the narratives will be shorter in the groups composed of strangers. This is expected for a similar reason to that mentioned above. According to Grice (1975), there is an expectation in North American culture that people will not speak more than is necessary, as stated by the sub-maxim 'be brief' which is listed under the Maxim of Manner. Strangers then, should adhere to this rule, and therefore speak less, on the whole, than the members of the couples group. This, as with

the other items included in the analysis of duetting, is done out of fear of seeming impolite.

2.3 Summary

In this chapter, the theoretical issues presented in chapter one were operationalized into a set of quantifiable items which could be used in the analysis of the narratives produced by duetting. In the next chapter, the methodology that was used to collect the narratives in both the pilot and the main studies will be discussed. As well, the guidelines for the transcription of the narratives and the scoring of the data, using the information presented in this chapter, will be discussed.

Chapter 3 - Methodology

3.0 Introduction

This chapter provides an overview of the methodology used in the present study. Section 3.1 includes discussion of the participants used in the study and the criteria for placement in the experimental groups. Section 3.2 outlines the procedure used to collect the data, from its original conception in the pilot study to its finalized form. Section 3.3 discusses the analysis of the data, including the guidelines used in transcribing the narratives.

As this was the first known experimental study involving duetting and politeness, there was very little by way of established methodology relating to these areas on which to rely. One of the only empirical studies found that dealt with politeness in conversation or narrative production was the sociolinguistic study done by Carolyn Straehle (1997), where she was interested in the different stereotypes of social interaction between Americans and Germans. Specific questions were asked about the politeness and rudeness of speakers in the different cultures, and the resulting conversations were recorded and analyzed. This methodology, an interview style of data collection, was not ideal for the purposes of the present study, however. Where Straehle was interested primarily in the content of what was said, what is of importance in this study is the language itself. An experimental design with more carefully controlled conditions was more desirable.

3.1 Subjects

Subjects were 40 native speakers of English. Though a majority of the participants were university students, many were from the private sector. Two groups were used in the study, with 20 people in each. The first of these groups was labeled the couples group. The second group was the control, called the strangers group.

The criterion for entry into the couples group was that one member of the couple had to be male and the other female. The couples had to have been married or living together for one year or more at the time of data collection. This cut-off was chosen because it was assumed that couples married or living together for a year or more would be comfortable enough together that more formal conventions of politeness would have a minimal effect on the narrative production compared to that of strangers. The control group was composed, again, of male and female pairs, but in this group the members of the pairs were strangers.

3.2 Procedure

A typical study of single-person narrative production involves a participant watching a short film-clip and providing an on-line description of what is occurring on the screen (Chafe, 1979, 1980; Prideaux, 1996, 1997; Prideaux & Hogan, 1993). A short unrelated distractor task and then an off-line description of the same clip follow this on-line production. Depending on the needs of the investigator, there can also be follow-up sessions, the first usually occurring after a two-week period, where the participant provides a second off-line description. Other studies have included a third off-line session

a year after the viewing of the clip (see, for example, Chafe, 1979). The present study followed a similar format to those above with some changes to be discussed below.

3.2.1 The Pilot Study

A pilot study was conducted to determine whether the chosen methodology was effective for producing the duetting phenomenon. Participants were first asked to watch a short film clip presented without sound. After this, they filled out a questionnaire (from another study) to prevent them from rehearsing the events of the clip. The final task was for them to tell the story of the clip, together, to the experimenter and this narrative was then recorded.

There was a problem in the pilot study with the length of the narratives produced, however, a problem that typically does not occur in narrative production studies involving individuals. In solo narrative production studies, the on-line description of the movie clip serves to increase the likelihood that the participant will remember more of the stimulus material. In a duetting study, because both participants must watch the clip together, there was no way to control an on-line description, so the subjects were asked to remain silent during the viewing of the clip. As well, the questionnaire which was used as a distractor task was extremely long. In most cases it took over five minutes to complete, and it seemed as thought the subjects were forgetting much of the details of the clip they had watched. These factors resulted in the subjects producing a very sparse amount of data. Appendix A is a transcription of a duet produced by a couple who did not speak during the viewing of the clip.

Asking the participants to discuss the clip while watching it does not control for the possibility that one person might talk more than the other, though it does result in

more narrative production. This was discovered by accident during the pilot when one couple was not told to remain silent during the viewing. While waiting for them to finish, they were overheard speaking to each other about the situation in the movie. Appendix B is a transcription of the duet produced by this couple. As one can see, there is much more narrative produced here than by the couple who remained silent during the viewing. As well, there are more interruptions, interjections, corrections, side comments, and the like. Asking the members of the duet to discuss the clip as they watch it increased the amount of narrative produced. As was mentioned, this on-line narrative would be difficult to control, but that in itself would serve to amplify the effects of politeness. That is, politeness, and the factors influencing politeness, would be equally contributing factors in both the on-line description and the subsequent off-line description.

An alternative instruction would be to ask only one of the members of the duet to provide the on-line description. This would increase the saliency of the clip for the one talking, but it would also increase that person's authority to tell the story, which is a violation of Falk's (1979, 1980) second characteristic of duetting, that of having equivalent authority to tell the story.

It was also felt that giving the participants a motivation to provide as much information as possible would be useful. In the pilot study, participants were only instructed to provide as much information as possible and to be very specific about the events in the clip. In the main study however, they were also told that their recording would be played to someone at a later time, and that person would then be tested on the events in the clip based only on the tape recording of the narrative provided by the couple. As well, it was decided that a considerably shorter distractor task would be used

between the viewing and the telling of the story. This shorter task, and the improved instructions, served to increase the amount of narrative that the pairs of participants produced, as can be seen by the transcriptions in Appendices E and F.

3.2.2 The Main Study

For the main study, a design similar to the pilot was followed with only a few modifications. Subjects were seated side-by-side and asked to watch the film clip. They were also asked to discuss with each other what was occurring in the clip while they were watching it. There was no sound provided to accompany the clip. The clip that was chosen to be used is from the movie *Adam's Rib* starring Spencer Tracy and Katherine Hepburn. It is approximately 4 minutes long and involves a marital dispute between the two actors who are portraying lawyers on opposing sides of the same court case. After the presentation of the clip, the subjects were asked to write down the first ten nouns they could think of. This served as the distractor task, in place of the long questionnaire. Following this, they were asked to tell the story, together, of what happened in the clip to the experimenter. The interviewer answered no questions and provided only minimal feedback such as nods, *mm-hmm*s, and other back-channeling responses. As mentioned above, the participants were told that the narrative they produced would be played to a third participant at a later date. That person, who would not have seen the clip, would then have to answer questions about the clip based only on the narrative produced. It was felt that this would increase the participants' goal of communication, Falk's (1980) fourth criteria of duetting. The complete instructions given to the participants are included as Appendix C.

Subjects were not asked to return for any follow-up sessions after the initial session. There was no need to do this, as the study was not investigating memory per se, or its effects on event organization.

3.2.3 Follow-Up Questionnaire

After the production of their narrative, the couples were asked to fill out a short questionnaire. The purpose of this questionnaire was to probe the participants' feelings about the task, as well as to obtain overt comments about how they view interruptions. The questionnaire consisted of five questions. The first was a yes/no question, and the remaining four were questions asking for a rating from one to five:

1. Do you feel that you dominated the conversation you just had about the film clip? (yes/no)
2. Did you feel that you were interrupted by your partner? (not at all → very much)
3. How did being interrupted affect you? (not bothered → very bothered)
4. How do you rate yourself as a speaker when speaking with your friends? (very quiet → very verbose)
5. How do you rate yourself as a speaker when speaking with a stranger? (very quiet → very verbose)

The purpose of the first question was to simply gauge the speakers' perception of how much they think they spoke, and compare that to how much they actually spoke. The second and third questions were designed to see how much the speakers felt that politeness affected their discourse. The fourth and fifth questions were used to gauge the participants' self-reports with actual data. If a participant in the strangers group rated him- or herself with a 1 (very quiet) for the fifth question, yet dominated the conversation, then

the other self-reports were likely inaccurate. The complete questionnaire is included at the end of this paper as Appendix D.

3.3 Analysis

3.3.1 Transcription

The data were collected using a hand-held cassette recorder. After the data were collected, the tapes were transcribed. These transcribed narratives were broken down by clause and by speaker. Each speaker was labeled either M, for males, or F, for females. Any overlaps in speech were put into square brackets with the overlapping section being directly below the other. The following is an example of a portion of one couples' duet with overlapping sections:

F: yup and then he got up
and she lied down…[on the table]

M: [yeah she] layed down [on onto the table]

F: [and took her and]
took her towel off
and he was getting some oil

Clause boundaries for all conjoined clauses were chosen to be before any conjunction words like *and* or *but*. This was done to reflect how some conjunctions, like *but* or *if*, add semantic content to the following clause. Noticeable pauses in speech are indicated by three periods (…). Where the pause was extensive, a second set of three periods was included, but this was needed only rarely.

3.3.2 Scoring

As discussed in the previous chapter, several factors were being looked at and scored in the data. The first of these was numbers of interruptions and overlaps.

Interruptions were taken to be any change of speaker that did not involve a pause in speaking. Excluded from this group are answers to questions, general feedback indicators such as *yeah*, *mm-hmm*, or other back channels, and more generally, anything that was not said with the purpose of instigating a change in turn. Overlaps were much easier to score; they were quite simply any utterances, like interruptions, that were actually said while the other person was speaking. The interruptions were scored as the number of total interruptions over the number of turn changes as a whole. The overlaps were recorded as a function of the number of total interruptions. Also of interest, and this will be discussed at greater length in the results section, was where the interruptions and overlaps occurred.

Also scored were the number of hedges used by speakers. These were any tag questions or statements such as *I think* or *maybe* that were used to indicate a reluctance to assert or order. Hedges were tabulated as a total number used by each pair, and as a total number used by each experimental group as a whole. Overt politeness terms such as *excuse me, please, thank-you*, and the like were also scored as the number used by each pair, and the number of them used by each group.

The length of the narratives were recorded as functions of the number of clauses per pair and the number of words per pair, for comparison between the two experimental groups. Word-counts were scored both for the entire narrative, for use with the analysis of the follow-up questions, and as a per turn measurement for use with the overall analysis of politeness. The latter was important for the discussion of the research questions as outlined in chapter two.

3.3.3 Post-Study Questionnaire

For each participant, the actual numbers of clauses per turn and words per turn were tabulated and compared with the subject's rating of him- or herself. As well, the number of interruptions and overlaps that were imposed upon the person, that is the number of them that were instigated by the speaker's partner, were compared to the degree to which that speaker felt he or she was interrupted. The rating of how bothered the person was by this was also compared to the degree to which that person felt he or she was interrupted. It was expected that if people in the strangers group were interrupted more than they felt they were, those people's "bothered" ratings would be low.

In the next chapter the results of the analyses outlined above will be discussed, as well as the results of the statistical analyses. In the fifth chapter, the results will be discussed with regards to what they mean in light of the current study, and what they may mean to future work in this area.

Chapter 4: Results

4.0 Introduction

In this chapter, the results of the analyses that were outlined in the previous chapter will be presented and discussed. Statistical tests will then be reported on the results of those analyses to indicate their significance. This discussion will be broken down into two separate parts. In section 4.1, the results from the analysis of the transcriptions will be reported, and in section 4.2, the results from the analysis of the follow-up questionnaire will be discussed.

4.1 Transcription Analysis and Scoring

In this section, the results of the analyses of the transcriptions will be presented. Four separate factors were scored in the transcriptions: interruptions, hedges, overt politeness markers, and length of utterance. The raw scores from these will be presented as well as the results of the statistical analyses that were conducted.

4.1.1 Interruptions

The first measure to be discussed is the number of overlaps and interruptions that occurred in the duets of couples and strangers. As mentioned in Chapter 3, interruptions were taken to be any change of turn that did not involve a pause in speaking at the end of the utterance. Excluded from this group are answers to questions, back channels such as *yeah* or *mm-hmm*, and anything that was not said to instigate a change in turn. Overlaps in speech are also included in some of these counts (where indicated), as interruptions.

The following table shows the number of overlaps in speech and the number of interruptions (both including and excluding overlaps):

Table 1. Number of interruptions and overlaps in speech

Couples				Strangers			
Name	Interruptions w/ Overlaps	Interruptions w/o Overl.	Overlaps	Name	Interruptions w/ Overlaps	Interruptions w/o Overl.	Overlaps
1C	29	14	15	1S	24	19	5
2C	13	9	4	2S	13	8	5
3C	22	16	6	3S	6	6	0
4C	22	12	10	4S	39	33	6
5C	20	11	9	5S	19	18	1
6C	19	12	7	6S	3	2	1
7C	36	23	13	7S	14	11	3
8C	54	35	19	8S	7	5	2
9C	51	33	18	9S	9	9	0
10C	28	25	3	10S	12	11	1
Mean =	29.4	19	10.4	Mean =	14.6	12.2	2.4

The first statistical test that was done on these data was a *t*-test for independent samples comparing the number of interruptions that were used in total by the participants in each group. This was done to determine whether or not there was an effect of interruption, before a more detailed analysis of the type of interruption was done. As can be seen below, there is a significant effect of interruption. Couples are much more likely to interrupt each other than are strangers:

Table 2. *t*-test of Number of interruptions (including overlaps)

t-test	df	*t*	*p*
Interruptions (w/ overlaps)	18	2.701	0.0140

Overlaps and interruptions were treated separately for the first two statistical analyses to determine whether the two types of interruption were being treated differently between the two groups. It was not initially predicted that these two forms would be treated any differently by the participants, but clearly, as the results of the *t*-tests below illustrate, they are. It seems as though a speaker is just as likely to interrupt the other

speaker, regardless of whether the participants are strangers or a couple. However, intimacy definitely has an impact on whether someone is likely to speak at the same time as someone else. These data suggest that it is less polite to speak while someone else is speaking than it is to simply interrupt.

Table 3. *t*-tests on number of interruptions (without overlaps) and overlaps

t-test	df	*t*	*p*
Interruptions (w/o overlaps)	18	1.645	0.1140
Overlaps	18	4.16	0.0008

The next step in this analysis was to determine whether the number of interruptions that were used were a result of politeness, or simply the result of a more dynamic narrative. It was decided then to represent the number of interruptions (including overlaps) as a ratio to the number of turns taken by the pair in their narrative. The following table shows these ratios. The analysis of the number of turns taken by the participant will be included in the section dealing with length of utterances.

Table 4. Number of interruptions per number of turns

Couples				**Strangers**			
Name	Interruptions w/ Overlaps	Turns	Interruptions /# of Turns	Name	Interruptions w/ Overlaps	Turns	Interruptions /# of Turns
1C	29	39	0.744	1S	24	33	0.727
2C	13	20	0.800	2S	13	28	0.464
3C	22	30	0.733	3S	6	26	0.231
4C	22	31	0.710	4S	39	61	0.639
5C	20	26	0.770	5S	19	34	0.559
6C	19	26	0.731	6S	3	8	0.375
7C	36	56	0.643	7S	14	29	0.483
8C	54	64	0.844	8S	7	15	0.467
9C	51	74	0.690	9S	9	23	0.391
10C	28	48	0.583	10S	12	23	0.522
Mean =	29.4	41.4	0.725	Mean =	14.6	28	0.486

As can be seen, there is a significantly greater number of interruptions per turn in the couples group than in the strangers group. A *t*-test was done to test the significance of this difference, the results of which are found in Table 5.

Table 5. *t*-test of number of interruptions per turn

t-test	df	*t*	*p*
Interruptions / # of turns	18	4.770	0.0003

Based on the results from these *t*-tests, it is quite clear that politeness, insofar as it exists between couples and between strangers, has an effect on the number of times one speaker will interrupt another.

As mentioned in chapter 2, the nature of the interruptions was also investigated. It was felt that interruptions that occurred at clause boundaries would be considered more acceptable in situations involving more politeness than interruptions that occurred elsewhere. That is, the strangers, though they used a smaller percentage of interruptions, were expected to have a greater proportion of interruptions at clause boundaries instead of in the middle of clauses or phrases.

Interruptions were scored as occurring at clause boundaries when the interruption occurred at a point where the previous speaker appears to have ended a clause or sentence. The following is an example of an interruption that was scored as appearing at a clause boundary:

F: I it seemed
like they were joking [with] each other at first yeah

M: **[at first]**

In this case, the second speaker (M) could reasonably have assumed that the speaker had finished her sentence after the word *joking*.

Interruptions that occurred following a conjunction like *and,* or in the middle of a phrase or clause were not scored as occurring at clause boundaries. The following is an example of one of these interruptions:

M: being given a [given] a massage

F: **[giving]**

In this case, the interruption occurs in the middle of a noun phrase, and was therefore not scored as occurring at a clause boundary.

The following table shows the relationship between the number of interruptions that occur at clause boundaries and the number of interruptions in total:

Table 6. Percentage of interruptions occurring at clause boundaries

Couples				**Strangers**			
Name	Interruptions w/ Overlaps	Interruptions at C.B.	Inter. @ C.B. /# of Inter.	Name	Interruptions w/ Overlaps	Interruptions at C.B.	Inter. @ C.B. /# of Inter.
1C	29	18	0.621	1S	24	19	0.792
2C	13	7	0.538	2S	13	7	0.538
3C	22	16	0.727	3S	6	6	1.000
4C	22	9	0.409	4S	39	34	0.872
5C	20	16	0.800	5S	19	15	0.789
6C	19	11	0.579	6S	3	2	0.667
7C	36	17	0.472	7S	14	12	0.857
8C	54	29	0.537	8S	7	4	0.571
9C	51	36	0.706	9S	9	9	1.000
10C	28	20	0.714	10S	12	8	0.667
Mean =	29.4	17.9	0.610	Mean =	14.6	11.6	0.775

As can be seen, there are on average more interruptions occurring at clause boundaries in the narratives produced by the strangers than in that of the couples. A *t*-test was conducted on these scores and the results are shown in Table 7.

Table 7. *t*-test of interruptions at clause boundaries per total interruptions

t-test	df	score	*p*
Inter. at C.B. / # of Inter.	18	-2.540	0.0195

The number of interruptions that occur at clause boundaries is found to be in a significantly higher proportion among the speakers in the strangers group. This means that the strangers, though interrupting less than couples, interrupt at clause boundaries more to avoid seeming impolite. That is, when the strangers feel it necessary to interrupt, they try to pick the least intrusive place to do it.

4.1.2 Overt Politeness Markers

This next measure of politeness that was counted was the number of overt politeness markers used by the speakers to each other. As mentioned in chapter 2, these are words or phrases like *please, thank you*, and the like. It was expected that there would be more of these in the strangers' speech than in the couples'. However, there were no overt politeness markers found in the transcriptions of either the strangers or the couples. The most likely reason for this is that the speakers, though two separate people, are speaking as one person, and it is unlikely that a single speaker would use overt politeness markers on him or herself. If this is the case, then two speakers, speaking as one, would not use them either. This lack of overt politeness markers is also a good indication that the two speakers are indeed speaking to the experimenter and not to each other.

4.1.3 Hedges

The third factor that was scored in the study was the number of hedges used by speakers. Table 8 represents the number of hedges used by each of the pairs of participants, the number of hedges used in relation to the number of words, as well as the overall averages of hedges used for couples vs. strangers.

Table 8. Number of hedges used

Couples			Strangers		
Name	Hedges	#H/length	Name	Hedges	#H/length
1C	14	0.0192	1S	12	0.0254
2C	4	0.0127	2S	13	0.0399
3C	6	0.0141	3S	10	0.0377
4C	7	0.0104	4S	9	0.0144
5C	7	0.0123	5S	17	0.0249
6C	2	0.0082	6S	3	0.0185
7C	11	0.0142	7S	18	0.0408
8C	9	0.0143	8S	7	0.0208
9C	36	0.0381	9S	10	0.0313
10C	6	0.0123	10S	12	0.0490
Mean =	10.200	0.0156	Mean =	11.100	0.0303

It is interesting to note that of the hedges used, only two were tag questions, and both of these were used by the same pair of subjects in the strangers group. This low frequency of tags is a good indicator that the participants in the study were indeed speaking to the experimenter rather than to each other. That is, tag questions are often used to give up a turn or to encourage the other participant in a conversation to speak. In this study, participants were instructed not to engage the experimenter in the conversation. The only other recipient of the tag would have been the other duet member. The lack of tag question use indicates that the speakers were not treating their partners as hearers, but as co-speakers.

Statistics were performed on these data, again in the form of *t*-tests. The first test was performed on the number of hedges that were used by speakers. Before the analysis was done however, the ninth pair in the couples group was removed as their transcription used an extraordinarily large number of hedges. It was felt that this outlier, if included, would skew the results and would not allow a clear representation of what the group of couples were doing as a whole. For the sake of continuity, one of the pairs from the

strangers group was chosen at random and was removed. The following is the result of this *t*-test which excluded the outlier from the couples group and its counterpart in the strangers group:

Table 9. *t*-test of number of hedges used

t-test	df	*t*	*p*
Hedges	16	-1.974	0.0632

As can be seen, this result was not quite as profound as expected but is approaching significance. Perhaps with a larger sample of narratives produced by duetting, this result would become more interesting.

The second *t*-test was performed on the number of hedges used in relation to the length of the narrative as measured by the number of words in total. In this test, the outliers that were removed for the previous test were replaced. This was because the relation between the number of hedges they used and the length of their narrative was not significantly different than the other members of their group. Table 10 lists the result of this test:

Table 10. *t*-test of number of hedges per word

t-test	df	score	*p*
Hedges/ # of Words	18	-3.303	0.0042

This test showed a very strong effect of the number of hedges used per word between the two groups. The strangers used many more hedges than did the couples, as was predicted in chapter 2.

4.1.4 Length of Utterance

Three measures were used to determine the length of utterances produced by the participants in this study. The first of these was the overall length of the duet. This

represents the total number of words spoken by each pair of participants in their narratives. This measure was then averaged across all of the pairs in each of the two groups, strangers and couples. The second measure to be scored was the mean length of utterance (MLU). The MLU was taken as the average number of words spoken in each turn by each pair of participants. These MLUs were also averaged across all of the pairs in each of the two groups. A third measure is included in this analysis, the number of turns that were taken by speakers in each narrative. This factor was mentioned briefly in section 4.1.1, and will be discussed here in relation to length of utterance. Table 11 lists these data.

Table 11. Overall length of narratives and MLU

Couples				Strangers			
Name	Words	Turns	MLU	Name	Words	Turns	MLU
1C	730	39	18.718	1S	473	33	14.333
2C	316	20	15.800	2S	326	28	11.642
3C	425	30	14.167	3S	265	26	10.192
4C	672	31	21.677	4S	626	61	10.262
5C	568	26	21.846	5S	684	34	20.118
6C	245	26	9.423	6S	162	8	20.250
7C	777	56	13.875	7S	441	29	15.207
8C	631	64	9.859	8S	337	15	22.467
9C	946	74	12.783	9S	320	23	13.913
10C	486	48	10.125	10S	246	23	10.696
Mean =	579.6	41.4	14.827	Mean =	388	28	14.908

The first of these scores to be discussed will be the mean length of utterance. The averages of MLUs do not appear to be very different between the two groups. A *t*-test was conducted and it confirmed this suspicion.

Table 12. *t*-test of MLUs between the two groups

t-test	df	score	*p*
Words/turn	18	-0.039	0.9203

There is no significance between the number of words spoken per turn between the couples and the strangers groups. This result was not expected, since it was originally felt that the couples would have a significantly smaller MLU than the strangers because of the greater likelihood of interruption. This did not happen however, though the couples were more prone to interruption.

The next of these scores to be discussed will be the overall length of the narratives as measured by total number of words spoken. As seen in table 11, the average number of words per narrative is almost 25% more in the couples' narratives, a significant difference according to Table 13 below.

Table 13. *t*-test of number of words used per narrative

t-test	df	score	*p*
# of Words	18	2.216	0.0378

This result indicates that the Maxim of Manner, namely Be Succinct (Grice, 1975), is not as important to the more familiar couples as is it to the strangers who chose to speak less.

At first glance, it seems that a significantly greater number of turns in the narrative is used by the couples than by the strangers. The following table, representing the results from the *t*-test, show that this is not the case:

Table 14. *t*-test of number of turns exchanged by speakers in each narrative

t-test	df	score	*p*
# of Turns	18	1.839	0.0794

This score, though not significant, is obviously approaching significance, indicating that with a larger sample of narratives, it could become so. This particular measure in itself, however, is not very revealing. The greater number of turns in the couples' narratives may just be a result of the couples producing longer narratives.

It was then decided that the number of turns used as a function of the overall length of the narratives might provide a more accurate reading of how the participants behaved. Table 14 shows the result from this analysis.

Table 15. *t*-test of the number of turns taken compared to the overall length of the narrative

t-test	df	score	*p*
Turns/length	18	0.102	0.8830

The result of this *t*-test did not show significance either. There does not appear to be any relationship between turn-taking (not counting interruption) and politeness.

4.2 Post-Study Questionnaire

In this section, the feedback and personal thoughts provided by the participants in this study will be presented and discussed. This feedback was recorded by way of a post-study questionnaire, designed to gain an impression of the speakers' feelings, and not to contribute to the overall outcome of the experiment. Each of the questions will be dealt with according to the information that it was designed to collect. It should be mentioned at this time that the questionnaire was not given to the first four pairs in the couples group. These were the first pairs run in the study and it was not decided until after these were done to use a questionnaire.

4.2.1 Dominance

The first question that was asked on the post-study questionnaire was: *Did you feel that you dominated the conversation you just had about the film clip?* This question was designed to probe the accuracy of each participant's judgments. The following table shows both each participant's answers to the first question, and the actual number of words spoken by each person:

Table 16. Did you dominate the conversation?

Couples						Strangers					
Males	Q1	Words	Females	Q1	Words	Males	Q1	Words	Females	Q1	Words
1CM	n/a	n/a	1CF	n/a	n/a	1SM	N	180	1SF	N	293
2CM	n/a	n/a	2CF	n/a	n/a	2SM	Y	243	2SF	N	83
3CM	n/a	n/a	3CF	n/a	n/a	3SM	N	103	3SF	Y	162
4CM	n/a	n/a	4CF	n/a	n/a	4SM	N	312	4SF	N	314
5CM	Y	349	5CF	N	219	5SM	N	293	5SF	N	391
6CM	N	80	6CF	Y	165	6SM	Y	99	6SF	N	63
7CM	N	367	7CF	N	409	7SM	N	98	7SF	Y	343
8CM	N	244	8CF	Y	387	8SM	Y	172	8SF	N	165
9CM	N	541	9CF	N	405	9SM	Y	184	9SF	N	136
10CM	N	138	10CF	Y	348	10SM	N	113	10SF	N	133

It seems as though speakers had a fairly good impression of whether they dominated the conversation. Very few of the participants polled thought they spoke more or less than they reported.

4.2.2 Interruptions

In this section, the answers to questions 2 and 3 will be discussed. In question 2, participants were asked: *Did you feel that you were interrupted by your partner?* The participants responded by answering 1-2 (not at all), 3 (somewhat), or 4-5 (very much). Table 17 shows the responses to this question.

Table 17. Were you interrupted?

Couples				Strangers			
Males	Q2	Females	Q2	Males	Q2	Females	Q2
1CM	n/a	1CF	n/a	1SM	2	1SF	3
2CM	n/a	2CF	n/a	2SM	1	2SF	2
3CM	n/a	3CF	n/a	3SM	3	3SF	1
4CM	n/a	4CF	n/a	4SM	2	4SF	1
5CM	2	5CF	1	5SM	1	5SF	1
6CM	2	6CF	1	6SM	1	6SF	1
7CM	4	7CF	1	7SM	1	7SF	1
8CM	2	8CF	3	8SM	1	8SF	2
9CM	2	9CF	2	9SM	2	9SF	1
10CM	1	10CF	1	10SM	2	10SF	2

Of the 32 people polled, 27 of them provided a rating of 1 or 2 in answer to the second question. This indicates that more than 80% of the participants did not feel that they were interrupted to a great extent, and only 3 people felt that they were somewhat interrupted.

Question 2 asked: *How did being interrupted affect you?* The participants responded by answering 1-2 (not bothered), 3 (somewhat bothered), or 4-5 (very bothered). Table 18 outlines these results.

Table 18. Were you bothered?

Couples				Strangers			
Males	Q3	Females	Q3	Males	Q3	Females	Q3
1CM	n/a	1CF	n/a	1SM	1	1SF	1
2CM	n/a	2CF	n/a	2SM	1	2SF	2
3CM	n/a	3CF	n/a	3SM	1	3SF	1
4CM	n/a	4CF	n/a	4SM	1	4SF	1
5CM	1	5CF	1	5SM	1	5SF	1
6CM	2	6CF	1	6SM	n/a	6SF	1
7CM	2	7CF	1	7SM	1	7SF	1
8CM	1	8CF	1	8SM	1	8SF	1
9CM	1	9CF	1	9SM	1	9SF	1
10CM	1	10CF	1	10SM	1	10SF	1

The impact on the participants of being interrupted was negligible. No one reported being even somewhat bothered by the interruptions. It should be cautioned here, this may be just an alternate result of politeness. The subjects, though instructed to keep the answers to themselves, may not have wanted to seem impatient or put off by the interruptions they encountered. This may have prompted some of them to report falsely.

4.2.3 Verbosity

The last two questions on the questionnaire were designed to probe how the participants rated themselves as speakers. Question 4 asked: *How do you rate yourself as a speaker when speaking with your friends?* This question was included to find out how

the couples rated themselves as speakers when speaking with someone with whom they are familiar, as in the experiment itself. The participants responded by responding from 1-5, 1 indicating very quiet, and 5 indicating very verbose. The following is a table of the results from this inquiry:

Table 19. Are you quiet with friends?

Males	Q4	Females	Q4
1CM	n/a	1CF	n/a
2CM	n/a	2CF	n/a
3CM	n/a	3CF	n/a
4CM	n/a	4CF	n/a
5CM	4	5CF	4
6CM	2	6CF	3
7CM	4	7CF	4
8CM	3	8CF	4
9CM	4	9CF	5
10CM	3	10CF	5

Most of the participants in the couples group (75%) indicated that they were generally quite verbose (4-5) when it comes to talking with friends. Of the ones that did not, all spoke less than 250 words when producing their narratives.

Question 5 asked: *How do you rate yourself as a speaker when speaking with a stranger?* This question was included to find out how the strangers rated themselves as speakers when speaking with someone that they do not know, as in the experiment itself. The participants responded by responding from 1-5, 1 indicated a response of very quiet, and 5 indicated a response of very verbose. The following is a table of the results from this inquiry:

Table 20. Are you quiet with strangers?

Males	Q5	Females	Q5
1SM	2	1SF	2
2SM	3	2SF	2
3SM	1	3SF	3
4SM	4	4SF	3
5SM	1	5SF	3
6SM	4	6SF	2
7SM	5	7SF	4
8SM	1	8SF	2
9SM	3	9SF	3
10SM	3	10SF	4

This collection of results is somewhat less straightforward. There is no clear correlation between the ratings provided by the participants and the actual amount that each of them spoke. This would indicate that these participants have not formed as clear an impression of their tendencies, as had the couples. The reason that this may be so is because their judgments about verbosity with strangers were formed after participating in an experiment with someone who is now no longer a stranger. That is, if the questionnaire were given before the experiment started, when the participants were still strangers, they might have given more accurate estimations of verbosity.

4.3 Summary

In this chapter, the results of the scoring of the transcriptions were revealed, and described using statistical analyses. As well, the results from the post-study questionnaire were presented and discussed. In the next chapter, the information provided in this and the preceding three chapters will be brought together and discussed. Also to be included in chapter 5 are conclusions and some cautionary notes on the methodology and its impact on the interpretation of the study.

Chapter 5: Discussion and Conclusions

5.0 Introduction

In the first chapter, the phenomenon known as duetting was introduced as a style of narrative production in which two people tell the story together of an event that both of them witnessed to a third person. Also discussed in that chapter were the characteristics of duetting and politeness. In chapter 2, these ideas were operationalized into factors, such as hedges and interruptions, that could be easily counted and compared in transcriptions of narratives. The third chapter outlined the methodology that was used in the collection and analysis of the narratives. Chapter 4 contained all of the results of the analyses and results of the statistical tests that were run to describe them.

In this final chapter, conclusions will be drawn from the results reported in the previous chapter. In section 5.1, there will be a brief review of the goals of the study. Section 5.2 will discuss how those goals were reached, and the final section, 5.3, will include a discussion of these points and some cautionary notes.

5.1 The Goals Revisited

The main goal of this study was to test the effect(s) of politeness on duetting, a cooperative, turn-taking style of narrative production. As we saw in chapter 1, Falk (1979) outlined several items which characterized the conversational duet. One of these was familiarity. In order for duetting to take place, according to Falk, there must exist camaraderie between the producers of the narrative. It stood to reason then, that if two strangers were placed in a situation that required the production of a duet, it would not take place, at least not to the same extent that it did with the couples. It was felt that if

this were the case, it would be because the lack of familiarity or camaraderie between the strangers would increase the level of politeness that the speakers would be inclined to assume. The greater the politeness, the less likely it will be that strangers will interrupt each other or speak more, and the more likely it will be that they use more hedges, all of which are indicators of politeness.

A secondary goal of this study was to provide experimental evidence for this as-of-yet untested discourse phenomenon. In previous studies of duetting, only single narratives were used as the basis for forming conclusions and describing the duetting phenomenon. These studies looked at duetting from an anecdotal rather than an experimental perspective. It was felt that a look at this behavior from an experimental point of view, after collecting 20 examples of duetting, was both beneficial and necessary.

5.2 The Goals Achieved

In this section, the achieving of the above mentioned goals will be discussed. To test the effects of politeness on duetting, the primary goal of this study, four factors were included in the analysis of the transcriptions produced by the participants. These were the number of overlaps and interruptions, the number of overt politeness markers, the number of hedges, and the lengths of the narratives and of each utterance. There were two groups of participants included in this study, couples who had been married or living together for one year or more at the time of data collection, and pairs of complete strangers.

It was expected that the varied level of politeness in the groups, as determined by the level of camaraderie would greatly effect the use of the factors mentioned above. It

was expected that the couples, a group with stronger camaraderie and therefore a lower need for politeness, would use more interruptions and overlaps in speech, fewer overt politeness markers, fewer hedges, and would produce longer narratives, but shorter utterances. The strangers were expected to exhibit the opposite behavior.

The analyses of the results presented in the previous chapter show that these expectations were for the most part met. The first factor, the use of interruptions and overlaps, was a significant measure. Couples were far more likely to interrupt their partners than were strangers. This indicates that couples, who have a stronger level of intimacy, have less need for 'politeness' rituals. They are more concerned with relaying the information needed, than with maintaining the face of either of the speakers.

The use of overt politeness markers was not revealing, since none of the participants in the study used overt politeness markers. As mentioned in the previous chapter, this is most likely because the speakers are speaking as one person, to the interviewer, who as instructed, was merely recording the narratives and not participating in any way.

The use of hedges was quite an interesting measure. It was expected that the strangers would use more hedges, and specifically, tag questions, than the couples. There were in fact only two tag questions used in the narratives, and as discussed in chapter 4, this is another indicator that the speakers were speaking as one. The number of all types of hedges that were used was a very revealing measure. Strangers used a significantly larger percentage of hedges than couples. This indicates that strangers are less willing to make assertions about events without presenting the possibility of error. This is a face-

saving technique that is not needed by the couples as they are less worried about offending their partners.

The length of the narratives was equally revealing. Couples produced longer narratives than did the strangers. This is likely because the couples were more willing to violate Grice's Maxim of Manner which includes the clause Be Succinct. Couples are not as worried about dominating a conversation as are the strangers. The mean length of utterance (MLU) was not a very interesting measure. It was expected that couples, who are more likely to interrupt each other, would have shorter utterances, though longer overall narratives. This was not the case. The difference between the MLUs of the couple and the MLUs of the strangers was not statistically significant.

The secondary goal, that of testing a previously untested phenomenon under controlled conditions, was also a success. The narrative style known as duetting now has experimental evidence backing its six characteristics (Falk, 1980) as outlined in the first chapter. It has been shown that politeness, as it is represented by camaraderie, plays an important part in the duetting process. Also, the notion that each of the speaker's contributions count on both of their behalves, and that the speakers were in fact speaking as one, was shown to be a factor in the number of tag questions and overt politeness marker that were used. As well, the ideas of mutual knowledge and relative authority (watching the clip together), the shared goal of communication (to tell the story of the clip as instructed), and the idea that both speakers are speaking to a mutual audience (seated side by side speaking to the interviewer), were also tested and shown to be influencing factors.

5.3 Cautionary Remarks

It is important at this time to include some comments to qualify the above statements to some extent. As with any controlled study, there exists a certain degree of artificiality that can influence the behavior of participants. This study was no exception. It is very unlikely that in the world outside the lab, complete strangers would be compelled to engage in a conversational duet. Given that, it is still valid to say that all six duetting criteria must be present to some degree. The fact that strangers duetted in this study was only because they were told to do so. What is important are the things that the two groups did differently.

It should also be noted that this artificial atmosphere in which the duets were conducted might have had other side effects as well. It could be that placing the participants in this situation may have compelled them to say or do things that they would not normally do. However, the conditions were the same for all participants, so this adverse effect should have applied to all of them equally.

5.4 Conclusions and Implications for the Future

This study has revealed several things about duetting. The first of these is that the study has confirmed Falk's (1979, 1980) observation that duetting is a style of narrative production that is characterized by six criteria: the speakers have the same mutual knowledge, the same relative authority to discuss the topic, they have a shared goal of communication, the speakers' contributions count on both of their behalves, they are speaking to a mutual audience, and most importantly to this study, the speakers share a

sense of camaraderie with each other. However, even strangers will exhibit the duetting behavior when camaraderie is absent, but the other five criteria are present.

This latter idea, that participants in a duet share a sense of camaraderie, was of central concern to this study's focus on politeness. It was found, not surprisingly, that the lower the sense of camaraderie and familiarity that existed between the speakers, the greater the level of politeness also existed. This was shown by the varying number of hedges, interruptions, and the like, that were used by the participants.

It was also shown that the participants in the study were quite accurate at gauging their level of interaction after performing the required task of creating a cooperative narrative. For example, they generally reported dominating the conversation when they actually did so, and vice versa. One discrepancy however, was the accuracy of the reports made by the strangers about their verbosity when speaking with other strangers. It was felt that this is because after the study was completed, they no longer viewed themselves as strangers.

Ideally, this study would have continued for a longer period of time, allowing for a considerably larger set of transcriptions to be collected. This would have allowed for better insight into the duetting phenomenon and for stronger conclusions to be drawn about it. If this study were to be conducted again, it would be advisable to attempt to collect the data in a more relaxed environment, rather than in the confines of a language lab.

Overall, this study was successful. The goals that were set at the outset were achieved and interesting results were obtained. This study has shown that politeness can influence the production of a narrative formed by duetting to a great extent, and that low

camaraderie and a lack of familiarity between speakers are essential to creating an atmosphere of politeness. The study has also provided another example of how discourse analysis can benefit greatly from an experimental approach.

References

Boggs, S. T. (1985). *Speakeing, relating, and learning: A study of Hawaiian children at home and at school.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983) *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clark, H. H. (1992). *Arenas of language use.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Chafe, W. (1979). The flow of thought and the flow of language. In T, Givon (Ed.) *Discourse and syntax. (Syntax and Semantics, 12).* New York: Academic Press.

Chafe, W. (1980). The deployment of consciousness in the production of a narrative. In W. Chafe (Ed.) *The pear stories: Cognitive, cultural, and linguistic aspects of narrative production. (Advances in Discourse Processes, 3).* New Jersey: Ablex.

Chafe, W. (1994). *Discourse, consciousness, and time*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Chafe, W. (1997). Polyphonic topic development. In T. Givon (Ed.) *Conversation: cognitive, communicative and social perspectives. (Typological Studies in Language, 34).* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Falk, J. (1979). *The duet as a conversational process*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Princeton University.

Falk, J. (1980). The conversational duet. *Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society, 6,* 507-514.

Fraser, B. (1990). Perspectives on politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics, 14,* 219-236.

Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: Essays on face to face behavior.* New York: Anchor Books.

Goodwin, C. (1986). Audience diversity, participation and interpretation. *Text, 6,* 239-247.

Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.) *Speech acts. (Syntax and Semantics, 3).* New York: Academic Press.

Lakoff, R. (1973). The logic of politeness: Minding your p's and q's. *Chicago Linguistic Society, 9,* 292-305.

Meier, A. J. (1990). Passages of politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics, 24,* 381-392.

Michaels, S. & Cook-Gumperz, J. (1979). A study of sharing time with first grade students: Discourse narratives in the classroom. *Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society, 5,* 647-660.

Norrick, N. R. (1993). *Conversational joking.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Norrick, N. R. (1998). Retelling stories in spontaneous conversation. *Discourse Processes, 25(1),* 75-97.

Prideaux, G. D. (1996). Lexical access and prototypes in language production. *LACUS Forum, 23,* 125-136.

Prideaux, G. D. (1997). Changes in the mental representation of events over time. *LACUS Forum, 24,* 316-325.

Prideaux, G. D., & Hogan, J. T. (1993). Markedness as a discourse management device: The role of alternative adverbial clause orders. *Word, 44(3),* 397-411.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking in conversation. *Language, 50,* 696-735.

Schegloff, E. A. (1992). In another context. In A. Duranti & C. goodwing (eds.), *Rethinking context* (pp. 191-227). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Schiffrin, D. (1994). *Approaches to discourse*. Cambridge: Blackwell.

Sperber, D. & Wilson, D. (1986). *Relevance*. Cambridge: Blackwell.

Straehle, C. A. (1997). *German and American conversational styles: A focus on narrative and agonistic discussion as sources of stereotypes*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Georgetown University.

Tannen, D. (1978). The effect of expectations on conversation. *Discourse Processes, 1*, 203-209.

Tseng, M. (1996). An examination of Chinese invitational discourse: How Chinese accept an invitation. *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences, 26(1/2)*, 341-356.

Watson, K. A. (1975). Transferable communicative routines: Strategies and group identity in two speech events. *Language in Society, 4*, 53-72.

Appendix A - Transcription of Pilot Couple 1

Subject Pair 1(Pilot)

M: ahh film two people having a massage ahh
taking turns doing it
obviously friendly with each other
I'd say either husband or wife or lover of some sort

F: probably husband and wife
that'd be my guess…
they're at home a guy other than xxx
and she's rubbing his back…umm…

M: it seemed as though ahh
they got into a little bit of playful fighting
and the wife took it
not as playful as the husband did
which turned into an argument leading in…

F: to crying…

M: yes crying
apologizing anger on both parts……

F: yeah a lot of arguing for awhile…
like shouting at one another
he came back
to make an apology of some sort

M: at which point the wife got angry
and kicked him in the ass…

F: to get back to the playful fighting

M: yes (laughs)

F: its funny that now I feel better

M: (coughs) and that's about it

Appendix B - Transcription of Pilot Couple 2

Subject Pair 2(Pilot)

F: Catherine Hepburn and

M: Spencer Tracy

F: yep giving each other back massages [and]

M: [or] trying to

F: (laughs) no then he got rude
and smacked her on the butt
which he [thought was]

M: [after she got] rude
and smacked him on the butt

F: oh yeah she started first

M: that's right she did

F: ok and so she kind of gave him a little love slap
and then he it was he was rocking side to side
he was pretty relaxed
and kind of giggling
and they were talking back and forth
and then they switched…turn about
and it was his turn
to give her a massage
and then he didn't massage her for even nearly as long
as she massaged him
and then he smacks her on the butt but she

M: yeah but she was talkin' the whole time
she was talkin to him during the time
she was giving him the massage
and during the time
he was giving her the massage

F: is that why he smacked her

M: I dunno [but]

F: [ok]

M: it would be probably ahh that she induced it

F: no I I don't think so
anyway what happened was

M: I think so

F: no he had goo all over his hands
and and he had smacked her already
then he went
and got goo all over his hands ready to [continue]

M: [she] didn't want to play anymore

F: she didn't wanna play anymore she got mad [because I think]

M: [she got mad]

F: he over hit her

M: you think she..he over hit her

F: yeah he hurt
cause he didn't know his own strength
anyway he thought it was a big joke
so he [continued]

M: [she] wasn't expecting the to get the smack on the bottom

F: right …so anyway then he tried to apologize
and tell her listen
what's good for the goose
is good for the gander
you can dish it out
but you can't take it
he's got goo all over his hands
he starts realizing
he's not gonna talk her into it
and she gets [madder] and madder

M: [huffy] huffy (laughs)

F: and then

M: and then she starts to cry

F: yeah

M: using those feminine tools that she knows so [well she]

F: [whatever]

M: starts crying and then
so he leaves the [room]

F: [no] then he still gets mad at her
he's still telling her [y'know]

M: [yeah] but those are crocodile tears
then he walks out of the room [and but then]

F: [well he but he]
remember he's holding her
like shaking his wagging his hand and fingers at her

M: then he walks out of the room
and then he stops to [realize]

F: [yeah] realizing he's not gonna get lucky tonight
so he's got to go back
apologize with his tail between his legs
[and grovel]

M: [xxx]
well, I don't know
that he was groveling
it was the situation where he wa-
if he wanted to get anywhere with her
he had to make up with her

F: yeah and have better sex
by having make up sex

M: well hopefully

F: see that's it

M: end of story

Appendix C - Instructions

The Narrative Study

Instructions

Thank you for agreeing to participate in my study, which investigates the language people use for descriptions. You will view a short film clip from a movie you may or may not have seen before. During this viewing, discuss with your partner what is going on in the clip.

When you have finished watching the clip, you will be asked to fill out a short questionnaire. After this, your task will be to describe the film clip, together with your partner, to an interviewer. Your description will be audiotaped.

It is important that you be as detailed and as thorough as possible in your description of the clip. At a later time, the recording that you produce will be played to someone who has never seen the clip. This person must have a clear understanding of what went on in the clip as he or she will be questioned about the events in the clip based solely on your description of the events.

Do you have any questions before we proceed with the experiment?

Appendix D - Post-Study Questionnaire

Post-Study Questionnaire

Please take some time to answer the questions below. Do not share your answers with your partner in the study.

1. Do you feel that you dominated the conversation you just had about the film clip?

   yes no

2. Did you feel that you were interrupted by your partner?

   not at all somewhat very much

   1 2 3 4 5

3. How did being interrupted affect you?

   not bothered somewhat bothered very bothered

   1 2 3 4 5

4. How do you rate yourself as a speaker when speaking with your friends?

   very quiet very verbose

   1 2 3 4 5

5. How do you rate yourself as a speaker when speaking with a stranger?

   very quiet very verbose

   1 2 3 4 5

Name (for records only): _____

Thank you very much for your participation in this experiment.

Appendix E - Transcriptions of Couples Group

Subject pair 1C

F: the tape started
I think
it said that morning
and uhh it showed the man…

M: being given a [given] a massage

F: [giving]
yeah the woman was giving the massage

M: and the man looked the man
you couldn't really see
if he was talking or not
because his head was actually down
and his arms were crossed in front of him with uhh
it looked like
his right arm was over his left arm…
and he was he had his head curled up in between it
so you couldn't really tell
if he was talking or not
while the woman was definitely talking to him
and she looked like
she was kinda having fun…[so]

F: [yeah] and then
he'd put up he put up his head a couple times
and he was smiling

M: yeah so it looked like
he was enjoying the massage umm
and then that went on for a couple of minutes
she would give him a massage
looked like
she was actually doing like a vigorous job of doing it like an energetic job
and then she gave him a slap on his bottom

F: yeah

M: and he kind of looked startled about that
he he wasn't expecting it
he was surprised by being slapped on his bottom

F: yup and then he got up
and she lied down...[on the table]

M: [yeah she] layed down [on onto the table]

F: [and took her and]
took her towel off
and he was getting some oil and

M: and he was preparing to rub her and

F: [then]

M: [and] then she was actually she was laying down
but she was on her forearms
and she was holding up the towel against her breast
while she was still looking up
so she was actually off the table a bit
and you could tell
that she was talking
you could actually see her face a lot better than the man [when]

F: [yeah]

M: he was laying on the massage table

F: and then he had that jar of gunk and he like

M: yeah but that was after [he ahh]

F: [was it]

M: because he he ahh he slapped her butt
and then she got up
[and she was]

F: [**no no**] but before that he was like rubbing her really hard
remember he [was like]

M: [yeah yeah]

F: really reefing on her back and then
and then she he slapped her butt
and she got up
and she was like yellin' at him

M: and she was quite angry

F: and that's when
he had the jar
and he was like getting more stuff out

M: and trying to
it looked like
he was trying to convince her
to sit back down
or lay back down
and he would be nicer
and do a better job or whatever
but she was actually quite angry about it
and then pretty soon the debate started to heat up a little bit more
until they were both yelling at each other
and pointing fingers and stuff like that

F: and then she went over
and sat down [and]

M: [yeah]

F: started crying [or
and then he left]

M: [yeah,she sat down and]
started crying
and then he ahh he tried to make her feel better for a couple [of times]

F: [right]

M: and then she ahh she didn't look like she
her mood was improving any
so then he got a little bit more verbose umm about it maybe even a little vehement
and then ahh she got really more like
she was a little bit more angry
and ahh started to like kinda shake and scream and stuff like that
and use some body language
and so he left the room at that point in time
and it looked like
he walked into the bedroom
because there's a four-poster bed umm with within the room
that he walked
and he kind of paused there for a couple of minutes
and then he ahh left the room again

and walked out
[to where the woman was sitting]

F: [and that's when she really started] to freak

M: [and then]

F: [when he was] out of the room

M: yeah

F: and then he came back and…

M: and [she]

F: [started] talking to her again

M: yeah tried to talk to her again
but the mood didn't improve any
she still looked like
she was umm angry and sad
and he looked like
he was actually kind of bitter towards her because of her her mood and attitude
so and then it went to ahh
and then after that basically it went into the thing where it ahh the little cut off
and it ended

Subject Pair 2C

M: ok started out with
a…guy getting a back rub ahh…
they're talking back and forth
and…[he said something]

F: [and]

M: oh go ahead

F: no he he looked really really
and she was being really nice
and…the room was kind of all cluttered up and anyway
what were you saying oh right
they they were he was getting a massage
and she was talking
and he was kinda just relaxed

NOTE TO USERS

Page(s) not included in the original manuscript are unavailable from the author or university. The manuscript was microfilmed as received.

61

This reproduction is the best copy available

UMI

and he left

M: then he started to feel bad
went back in and ahh…

F: (laughs)

M: went to apologize
and she kicked him in the leg

F: pretty hard and then and then she stormed out again
and he was like… I dunno
did he say just [whatever]

M: [he] just left there

F: yeah I think
that's all I can think of

Subject Pair 3C

M: ok the clip starts out
with the woman massaging the man's back
they're both in towels

F: no he's wearing a robe xxx

M: umm…actually he's massaging his back
they're talking
they seem happy…ahh…
then she pats him on the ass (laughs)

F: (laughs)

M: and ahh…continues to massage his back ahh

F: and she massages his head

M: yeah then she starts to massage his head

F: umm…she and then he gets up
and ahh she lays down or no
she wraps her towel to

M: around her hair

F: around [her]

M: [around] her head

F: and and she lays down on the table
and he gets a
I dunno

M: some [oil or something]

F: [oil on his hands]

M: to massage her back

F: and she takes her towel off her back
and he starts massaging her back

M: he puts a robe on when
he gets up as well…ahh…
they're massaging their back
talking again
they seem happy
and then ahh then he spanks her ass
and then she they seem to get upset
and get start to argue about something

F: and she [gets mad]

M: [I'm not] sure what yeah…ahh…

F: and they argue for quite a while
and he has this like lotion or something on his hands…
and then he puts it back [in the…jar]

M: [yeah at that] point she's sitting up too
she's not laying down anymore…right

F: yeah

M: yeah and she's gotten up
then they continue to argue…ahh

F: and then she looks like
she's starting to get upset
and he's still mad
and she goes

and she sits on a couch
[I think]

M: [there's this] yeah like a small chair or bench or couch or something on the side
and she has
she sits on there
they continue to talk
he stands over her ahh…or beside her (coughs)

F: she's crying

M: talking to her
and she gets really upset
and starts to cry ahh…

F: and then for a second he looks like
he's feeling bad
about [yelling at her]

M: [or sympathizing] for her yeah

F: and then he starts getting madder again
and he goes into the ahh
he walks out of the room
he must be going to the bedroom or something
and then he get
he sort of looks like
he feels bad again
and then he comes back in
like he's going to apologize or something to her
and he stands in front of her
and she kicks him
and they get mad again at each other
and they're yelling…and…(laughs)

M: well after she kicks him
she gets up
and walks away
walks past him to the corner of the room
and then he ahh that's the end of the clip

Subject Pair 4C

F: ok the movie starts with the words that evening on a

M: big theatrical stage curtain and

F: mm-hmm

M: yeah…

F: and then they're

M: it fades into a scene
where two people are umm well
a woman's giving a guy a massage
it's a black and white film
they're both wearing towels umm…

F: they're bantering friendly friendly bantering
[I]

M: [yeah]

F: would say

M: he makes teasing remarks every now and then
and she'll like kind of slap him
or she'll you know

F: she's she kind of spanks him on the bum…

M: and stuff like that and she umm starts off giving him a back massage
and then she works her way up to giving him a scalp massage
and then she finishes
and they're discussing the whole time
they're they're having this discussion
and uhh then she finishes off
and uhh she gets up
she puts her head in a towel
she wraps her head in a towel and [uhh] [her]

F: [her] hair her [hair]
in a towel

M: her hair in a [towel]

F: [and] uhh…

M: (laughs) umm then she gets on to the table
and he gets off
he puts a robes on a robe on
while she's putting her hair in a towel

and then ahh she lies down on the table
and he puts oil on his hand
and starts to massage her
and they're talking some more
and then he smacks her on the butt really hard
or at least harder than she did to him
and he's not to hap
she's not to happy about that to
he seems oblivious
that he did anything wrong umm
until she gets up
and starts yelling at him
and then he's playing stupid
like okay what did I do oh
come on now you know that kind of thing
and ahh he's taking it really lightly
but she's really upset
does this sound good so far

F: (laughs) yeah [keep] going

M: [ok] umm... and then when he realizes
that she's seriously upset
he ahh stops being so light about it
and he starts yelling at her
and there's an argument going on back and forth and ahh...

F: she goes and sits in a chair

M: well before she he does that
he's got cream or something on his hands
and so he takes the cream off
like he was just about to put it on her
when she jumped up
and so he's putting it back into a jar off his fingers
and while he's doing that
she goes
and sits down
he comes over
kind of yells at her some more
she breaks into tears
and then he's like oh like
you can see he's typical male type attitude like oh great
and he starts to try
and make light of it
or to try

and stop her from crying
and you know [umm] [yeah]

F: kind of he kinda says oh oh come on [that] kind of [attitude] oh come on don't cry

M: and ahh he like he wiped a tear from her cheek and stuff like that
but umm doesn't work
and he then gets upset
and starts pointing his finger at her
and then he storms off
after she just totally wails
let's out with the crying like seriously
and umm he walks into a room
and then he sits there
and he gets this

F: no he walks out of the [room]

M: [walks] walk he walks out of the room into another room
and he gets this thoughtful look on his face
and he kinda he feels a little bit guilty or a little bit bad about the situation
so he goes back in
and he again he's trying to make light of it
and he's trying to say you know
whether he's apologizing or not
we're not sure
but it looks like he might [be trying]

F: [he looks] guilty

M: he looks like
ok I screwed up
and so he's trying to make
her feel better
and it doesn't work umm
so he talks a little bit harsher to her
not as much as he was before
she kicks him
and ahh then gets up
and says something to him and then ahh

F: [storms] out of the room

M: [he] storms out of the room
and that's… the end of the clip

Subject Pair 5C

M: Kate Hepburn and ahh Spencer Tracy were dressed in bathrobes umm
and initially at the beginning the beginning of the clip ahh ST was on his ahh front
on a table
receiving a massage from Kate ahh
who were married
I guess
as it would suggest from
had a close relationship
as as suggested by the situation
and ahh they were rather playful and ahh happy
it seemed
as they ahh as ahh Spencer was receiving his massage
and as they came to the end of the massage
Kate gave him a light tap on the ahh butt
and ahh they got up
and switched places

F: right she was very merry
I thought
she was definitely being flirtatious
and she wrapped her head in a towel
and umm she layed down
and unbuttoned the back of her towel
and she was still chatting rather animatedly
I thought
and he started putting cream on his hands
and he was actually being
I thought
quite aloof
he was seemed almost seemed detached
I mean
he was just keeping a distance
so he started to massage her
and they continued ahh
she again very merry animated
and umm he was
as I said cooler
and then he wacked her [on the butt]

M: [something happened] in their discussion
as it became just a little bit heated
and he responded her
by slapping her very hard
and which she immediately bounced up from the table

stood beside it with the towel around her
and was extraordinarily angry
and began to speak to him in a very angry way

F: mm-hmm and he remained actually fairly calm [initially]

M: [fairly calm] at first

F: almost dismissive sort of like
this isn't
I had the sense
that he thought
that she was overreacting

M: he was trying to remain aloof from the situation [and]

F: [right]

M: he was very much in control
she had [lost]

F: [yes]

M: become emotional
he was maintaining his ahh his control
got to the point
that she was so angry
she actually sat down
and began to…[cry]

F: [cry]

M: she was very close to losing it before then
but actually began to cry umm [just lightly]

F: [and there was one] point
when she was really angry with him
that he stood quite close to her
and I had the sense
that he that she had power
I felt
that there were a lot of power exchanges going on
and I felt
that at that point that she held all the power
and he was a little bit worried
but the moment that she started to cry

he had regained the power in the relationship

M: and I think
his first response was to become somewhat paternal
he was avuncular
he was taking taking charge
and then he even got to the point
that he became angry
and started lecturing her
and ahh she cried all the more
he left the room

F: right

M: he left the room angry
and with her sobbing hideously in the other room
the moment he left the room
he realized what a heel
he had indeed been
started feeling quite guilty
went back somewhat hunched and bedraggled for ahh something of an apology
ahh which she was not accepting

F: the power shifted again

M: she had the ahh power

F: [mm-hmm]

M: [to some] extent she took advantage of it
and then when he tried to gain the power again
she turned
and gave him a kick
[well from]

F: [that's right]

M: a sitting position she was sitting
he was standing over her
and he she gave him a kick
[got up]

F: [and she] walked out

M: and walked out

F: that's it

Subject Pair 6C

F: ok umm it starts out
with a woman massaging a man
and they're both dressed up only in towels

M: ahh the expressions on their faces the guy seemed rather subdued…

F: yeah but she was [all relaxed she was enjoying] it

M: [relaxed and just] and

F: and then we think
he made a request of her
and then she slapped him
and then what happened then…
I don't know what [happened then]

M: [I think they] switched

F: and then they switched placed
he she put the towel on her head

M: yeah

F: they switched places

M: he was roughing or [well massaging…roughly]

F: [he was very mean he's not as nice]
he's not as nice
he's very mean
and then he spanks her way harder
than she did to him
and then she gets upset

M: wounded

F: yes whatever wounded pride
and she gets upset
and umm…they start arguing
and she starts crying
and she gets her towel all dressed up again
she cause she took it off for a minute

and then why am I talking

M: I don't know
cause you're more descriptive
than I am but [anyway]

F: [ok anyways]...

M: [it's a guy]

F: [and ahh]

M: and he left short afterwards
well I think
and then he returned
and the look on his face was ahh guilty shameful [xxx]

F: [but it] wasn't like
she was being ving vindictive

M: no and then [when he came over]

F: [she was hurt]

M: she kicked him and then

F: cause he spanked her

M: he was shocked

F: and then it ended

M: yeah

Subject Pair 7C

M: ok so you can go first
what did you see

F: it it starts out umm
with a woman massaging a man
and he has his face down
and it sort of looks like
he's enjoying the massage
you don't really see
and she's talking away

she's like

M: chatting

F: kind of [preoccupied y'know]

M: [light light] conversation

F: but y'know like…

M: massaging him in and

F: looking like
she has issues you know
and umm…[and then]

M: [they're discussing] something

F: they're talking about something
and then he he must have said said something
and then she smacks him on [the ass]

M: [well but] before she smacks him on the ass
she massages his scalp

F: oh ok yeah

M: and then ahh he says something
and then she smacks him on the ass

F: and then umm…he does he get up right away…

M: no she smacks him on the ass
like [as in to say that's it]

F: [but it's just playfully]

M: y'know like ok that's it
get up
so then they get up
and ahh he puts his robe on

F: but she does two
cause she does one
that's just like [something he said]

M: [no she just she just] did the one…
[he slaps] (laughs)

F: [maybe] (laughs) he just did one

M: umm so then they get up
and he puts on his robe
and she puts her hair in a towel
and then she gets down on the table [and]

F: [like] they just have this massage parlor in their home

M: (laughs) so then he grabs the bottle of oil
puts one splash on his palm
slaps his hands together

F: and she's she's… really happy and chit-chatty
oh it's her turn and

M: yeah anticipating a massage…

F: and then he starts and it's
he doesn't massage hard or anything
how does the little fight start

M: I don't know he's just massaging her umm

F: and she's talking

M: and she's talking to him
and he's [concentrating on the massage]

F: [and he's like mmm mmm mmm]

M: and then she seems to say something
and he smacks her on the on the ass really hard…

F: yeah because then you don't know if she she
then she gets up…

M: yeah

F: you'd think this was days ago
like we've been marooned
and we can't [remember it]

M: [so she she jumps]
she jumps right [up]

F: [she] she gets up after that
and you don't know
if it's because of the the hard smack or
if it's because of the conversation but
because the the intense (noise mimicking bickering) goes on
you know
it can't be the smack
it has to be something else

M: yeah they're talking about something else

F: and then they're going back and forth pretty consistently
he's (noise mimicking bickering) and then she starts to cry…

M: umm

F: but they were both mad
and [yelling at each other and then and then obviously]

M: [yeah they're both mad and]
she puts her towel
and wraps it up
and kind of walks to the front of the screen
and then ahh he gets a little bit more mad
and she starts to cry
and he gets quite mad at that point
you can tell by his facial expression and his gestures
that he's really POed
so then that's when
she starts to cry
and it looks like
that softens him up a bit a little bit
doesn't it

F: well she sits down for some serious crying
and starts shaking crying
and then umm he comes
and sort of a little looks as though he's going to relent and then…like

M: brushes a tear from her eye…

F: and ahh but then starts again just (noise mimicking bickering)

M: yeah [and he really]

F: [and then]

M: loses his temper that time…

F: and then and she just keeps crying
and then he decides to leave
and then he gets just outside the door
and he stands there
and it looks as though
he's rethinking it
and he turns around
and he comes [back in]

M: [well and] she's openly sobbing at that point
like he can hear her
he goes to the other room
and she's really crying
so he feels guilty again
and feels bad
so he goes back to the room to console her again…

F: and what happens

M: and then she ahh she keeps crying
and he gets even more mad again for like the third or fourth time
and finally he ticks her off
and she ahh she kicks him in the shin…

F: but it looks like the the last part
it looked like as though maybe
she was kind of playing him a little bit
because like you can't just stop crying like that

M: mm-hmm

F: cause then she just it looks as though
she's won a little bit
when he comes back in
and then umm and then she says her bit
and then kicks him in the shin
and then stomps off

M: and that's the end

Subject Pair 8C

F: ok uhh the film was a black and white…film

M: film yeah it started off with a man and a woman
the man was laying down on the table

F: a light weight massage table

M: or massage table yeah

F: he had a white towel
or so it appeared to be white ahh
draped over his shoulders
and the [woman had]

M: [and the woman] was massaging his back

F: she was also wrapped in a towel
and she was standing to his right side
seemed to be massaging his back…
they were

M: they were talking [xxx]

F: [and having]
you could see
them having conversation
although [you couldn't]

M: [a conversation yeah]

F: hear what they were saying…
and then she smacked his butt [(laughs) and]

M: [yeah and]

F: he seemed to be surprised [and then]

M: [surprised] and then she massaged his scalp

F: and then she then she oh yes then she massaged his scalp

M: scalp

F: yeah…and they were still talking throughout this whole time

they were talking
you could see their [mouths]

M: [yeah]

F: and she got up
and wrapped a towel around her head [and]

M: [and]

F: he got up
and put a housecoat on

M: housecoat on and then she layed down

F: she layed down on her stomach
the way he was laying on his stomach as well…then he

M: and then he went
and put massage oil on his hands
and started [massaging]

F: [massaging]

M: her back…or he'd put a towel on
and started massaging her [back]

F: [man] massaged her back…

M: and then they were talking
and then he smacked her in the bum really hard

F: (laughs) and [she got really mad]

M: [it looked hard]
and she got really mad

F: and they stood up…
and they looked like
they were yelling at each other
she was yelling at first at him
and he looked like
he was being defensive and

M: yeah and he's just
he had a whole bunch of hand [cream on his…or…]

F: [yeah he had a bunch of cream on his hands]

M: massage cream or whatever it was on his hands
he's just standing there with his hands out…
taking what she was saying

F: yeah she was yelling at him
and tables kind of turned
and [she started]

M: [turned yeah]

F: yelling at her

M: and then he put the cream back in the container

F: and he walked over to the massage table
and the cream was [on the table]

M: [on the bed]

F: the cup is on the on the bed
or whatever it was
and he started glopping the cream
that was on his hands back into the tub…and

M: and then he was just…
[they're yelling back and forth]

F: [and he's…yelling back] and forth at each other

M: and she started [crying]

F: [and she] started to cry
and she sat down on a seat [that was]

M: [chair or] seat or something

F: was in the room…
and [she] started to cry

M: [and] yeah and then he walked out…

F: they yelled at each other…

M: not [quite sure xxx]

F: [ahh some more]...yelled at each other

M: and then he walked out of the room
and stopped just on the other side of the door...

F: yeah stopped in the [doorway and she was]

M: [she was still crying]

F: crying and...then he came back in

M: looked a little looked like to apologize
that he was sorry
and she gave him a swift kick in the leg

F: yeah she kicked him in the leg just above the knee...
and then they talked some more
looked like
they were still yelling

M: yeah

F: and she was still crying
and she stormed off...out different door
that he went

M: he was leave that he was gonna leave in

F: the door that he was gonna leave in
was on the right hand side of the screen
and she left out the top left...side...anything else

M: I think that's it

Subject Pair 9C

F: umm its black and white clip from a movie with Spencer Tracy and Katharine Hepburn umm
I forget what its called
I think
but I used to

M: I don't know

F: and umm...in it he she's giving him a massage at the beginning...

M: right they they and it looks like a yknow an enjoyable kind of kibitzing
pleasurable kind of experience in the in the first instance
ahh he's got a kind of a contented look on his face
and he's smiling
and I think
they're talking a little bit back and forth

F: yeah there wasn't supposed to be sound
I don't think no
I'll assume there wasn't (laughs)

M: yeah…right and ahh she's giving him a massage
he looks pretty happy
they're talking back and forth
and then she slaps him on the butt

F: yeah

M: and I don't know if…
I can't recall
if he looks angry
do you do you remember

F: I think
he looks kind of surprised [startled a little]

M: [surprised ok]

F: but not upset really…

M: and then they they change places he [he]

F: [she] puts a towel on her head

M: right oh yes ok well you've maybe remember more detail there in the changing

F: about the towel you were thinking
how good looking Katherine Hepburn [was at that point]

M: [yeah that's right]

F: anyway umm she puts a towel on her head
and then she lays down
she's got a
they're both wearing towels
oh we better point that out all along

she's got her towel on
and umm she's got her her arms under her
she's holding the towel to her chest
while he massages her

M: yeah

F: and

M: then at first she's looking very happy [y'know and]

F: [oh yeah she's smiling]

M: he's he's kind of going at the massage in a kind of workmanlike way
he's like furrowed brow
and he's he's really concentrating
and he's kinda

F: was he german

M: it didn't (they both laugh) it didn't look very
like it wasn't a soothing looking massage
he looked more
like he was kneading bread or or really yknow kind of a not a real kind of
I don't know
it looked it looked kind of intense for a massage

F: oh he was frowning
[he looked very serious]

M: [yeah he was frowning]
and also even his hands ah on her back seemed to be yknow kind of moving in a
in a way
that didn't didn't ahh imply
that there was
or seemed to show
that there was any kind of smoothing or relaxing motion going on
it was just kind of like a jack hammer more or less

F: and then the big moment he slaps her on the butt

M: oh right

F: quite sharply she's upset
she springs up

M: *my god Spencer* (KH voice) (they both laugh)

F: and umm and she's upset
she's not
so she yells at him

M: yeah [she starts]

F: [oh he's] got cream on his hands on both his hands [like]

M: [he's] got cream on both
his hands he she starts
there's a bit of a to and fro going then at that [point]

F: [no] first he looks sheepish
doesn't he
don't you think

M: yeah like bewildered after he smacks her
[and she gets mad]

F: [I don't get it] yeah
you did it to me

M: yeah you did it to me
so why is it bad
when I do it to you
and and it looked
like he hit her a little bit harder
than she hit him

F: and she was having fun
that's what you said [right]

M: [yeah] it looked playful
when she did it
it looked a little bit more like ahh
well there you go
when he did it [like]

F: [warm]

M: kind of yeah a little more a little bit something more it wasn't wasn't violent
but it was a little bit of something to it

F: a little something yeah

M: a little mustard on it

F: so and then he has cream on his hands
and he feels bad
she's yelling at him
but then I think he decides
well this is ridiculous
I've taken enough
and he gets mad
and he yells back at her

M: yeah and it starts to-ing and fro-ing
they walk towards each other
I think at one point
he's got the some kind of cream or massage product or something in his hands
and he's got his hands turned up and with this kind of yknow look of as if he's being
well now I'm confused
that was earlier
I think

F: yeah

M: now they're they're going at it ahh
and walking around
and yelling quite vociferously

F: and then she starts to cry

M: right

F: and then he feels bad for a second

M: no he leaves the room

F: oh yeah

M: and thinks about it
and then he walks back
and she's still crying
and for a while he's looking very very sheepish and very kind of oh yknow

F: he wipes her [tear away with his hand back of his hand]

M: [I probably…wipes her tear right]…

it's a gesture there
and and ahh he's looking kind of sheepish and then

F: move your hand away from your face so he can hear you

M: and then ahh and then he starts to almost scold her
and she's crying
and she's not really fighting back
but he's yknow
there's some finger pointing going on
and he's almost lecturing and
he's [stand]

F: [but I] think she's crying in a mad way too

M: no at this point it almost it appeared to me at this point
that she's kind of y'know crying
acknowledging that [yeah I've]

F: [he's right]

M: done wrong or something
[he's he's in some]

F: [ohh..ok]

M: kind of authority see that's
what I [presume]

F: [maybe] that's
why she's angry though
because she knew
he was right
like I got the feeling [that she]

M: [could be]

F: wasn't crying out of grief

M: right

F: or upset but more [frustration]

M: [hurt]

F: yeah yeah

M: yeah and then I think we're pretty much done the clip

F: that's the deal…ba-da-boom

Subject Pair 10C

F: ok so let's start
what did the curtains say
I don't remember like this evening or

M: sounds good

F: ok and then it opened on…
the guy no girl giving the guy a massage
and the girl was wearing a towel no and just a towel
and the guy was wearing a towel

M: yep

F: right

M: yep

F: and then they were talking
and she was massaging him
and she gave him like a head massage
was that after the spank or before the spank

M: it was after

F: after the spank

M: after

F: she spanked him
I don't know
and then she gave him a head massage…
and then……then they switched places

M: yeah [xxx]

F: [and] then she put a towel on her head

M: yeah she finished
and then she walked aw- walked away
and put a towel on her head

F: right

M: around her hair
because her hair was wet

F: right

M: and then he got up
and put his robe on
and she layed down…
and he got some cream

F: right

M: for some for his

F: from a bucket beside

M: on the counter

F: yeah on the counter…and then

M: and then he massaged her

F: yeah she took it
she undid her towel at the back
so he could massage
cause she had a towel up around her chest…right
then he was massaging her
and then when he retaliated by spanked her
she got all upset
then got up
and they had an argument
no he went to get cream
and she was all mad at him
and they had an argument
she pulled her towel up
and they were arguing right

M: yeah

F: and then she started crying

M: yeah and she went over
and sat on a chair

F: but he wiped the cream off first [into the bucket]

M: [yeah into the] bucket

F: yeah and he still had some on his hands
then she sat there
and cried
and he wiped up the stuff on the massage table or
whatever it was
and she was having a fit

M: yeah…started crying…

F: he got angry at her
didn't he

M: yeah

F: for crying

M: he thought
she was being ridiculous umm
and then [he walked]

F: [he's exasperated]

M: he walked out of the room
after they argued for awhile

F: and she was still crying

M: still crying and then ahh

F: and he felt bad
for walking out
cause you could see it in his face
he listened to her cry
and then he turned around
and walked back in…
oh you we forgot
when she first started crying
he wiped a tear away
to see if she was crying anyways
and then he came back in
and tried to comfort her
and then she kicked him

M: in the leg yeah

F: in the leg while she was still sitting down…and what then

M: she got up and
walked out
I think
didn't she

F: I have no idea
I don't remember
how it ended

M: she walked out to the on the far corner on the screen

F: and that's it

M: I think so

Appendix F - Transcriptions from Strangers Group

Subject Pair 1S

M: ok so the setting seemed to be an apartment

F: yeah it seemed like an apartment

M: and they had they had it like set up like a massage studio…and umm
there was a couple
and at the beginning the the woman was ahh like kneading the man's shoulders

F: yeah it was sort of like a a playful kind of a massage
that she was giving the man
then she gave him a bit of a head massage
and ahh swatted him on the butt

M: yeah and they were like talking
and and what were they like joking

F: I it seemed
like they were joking [with] each other at first yeah

M: [at first]

F: and and then they switched ahh places
and she was going to get the massage
and ahh he put oil on his hands
and then started to massage her
but then spanked her as well [and]

M: [yeah] except ahh a lot harder (laughs)

F: (laughs) yeah…

M: and umm and then she she got upset
and stood up
and then they moved away from the table
and started to argue…

F: and the the argument seemed
like she was really upset
but he didn't seem
like he really cared that much

M: yeah or he didn't [really] understand why she was upset

F: [he] yeah
and he had he had gotten ahh more cream on his hands
like he was getting ready to continue with the ahh the massage…
but she wasn't really having any part of it

M: no what did she do there
I can't remember [xxx]

F: [she ahh] she sat down
and ahh umm started cry
no she yelled at him for a few minutes
before she sat down
and then she sat down
and kinda started crying…

M: yeah and he tried to put the cream back into the container……

F: cause I guess he realized at that point that [that the massage was over]

M: yeah oh [yeah that the massage was over]
umm and then she started to
she started to cry…

F: really cry cry hard (laughs)

M: yeah and umm at first the man didn't seem very remorseful

F: yeah and ahh he turned
and and he started
and walked out of the room
and then sort of stopped
and I think he she he would
she was probably still crying quite hard at that point or…

M: or loudly anyway

F: loudly yeah

M: if you could hear

F: yeah and he stopped
and then went back in with sort of a look of remorse on his face
I think…umm
but she didn't want to have any part of it
I don't think

M: no yeah cause she kicked him

F: yeah (laughs) gave him a really hard kick
and then got up
and ahh walked out
made sure her towel was right around
and walked out

M: yeah that was the thing
when they started arguing
she ahh she she made sure
that her her towel was really tight (laughs)

F: (laughs) and that was it wasn't it

M: I think
that was it yeah

Subject Pair 2S

F: you can start (laughs)

M: I can go ahead and start ok umm
well it opens up
with a lady giving a guy a back rub ahh
seems like
it's in umm almost seemed
like it was in like a bathroom type area or something like that or a steam
steamroom or something umm
seemed like
there was an easy familiarity between the two
and she smacked him playfully a little playfully on the butt
to get his attention
it didn't look like [he] [yeah]

F: [he didn't] look [like]
he was pretty much interested
in what she was [saying]

M: [yeah] yeah and then ahh and then they changed places
and he had a bathrobe on
and she got on the table
and he put whatever
they put on their hands
to start rubbing her back

F: just oil of some sort

M: and he started rubbing her back
and she was sitting up
before he had his head down
and she kind of had her head up
so she could facilitate communication yeah…and ahh
then he smacked her…

F: and right away she got up
as if she was offended by it
or it really hurt kinda
you could tell

M: yeah

F: and I dunno
they went into another room
where [they]

M: [yeah]

F: had a lengthy argument kind of thing…

M: yeah and ahh then she got burst into tears kind of thing and

F: yeah

M: and he walked away into another room
and then kinda walked back in
and it looked
like he was apologizing

F: apologizing

M: and she didn't really accept it
cause she kicked him

F: she kept crying

M: yeah

F: but not as bad as before

M: no

F: it was more subdued

M: she did a good job of looking dignified too
even though all she had on was a towel but uhh yeah
she kicked him
and then walked off
and he just kinda

F: he followed her

M: did he
I thought
he was just sitting there
he just sat there yeah
he was just sitting there kinda
and then it went [to the cartoon] to the thing

F: [oh right]

M: yeah

F: that was it

Subject Pair 3S

F: it started out
the girl was massaging the guy
and he was lying on a table
and umm she looked
like she was enjoying herself
but he didn't look all that impressed and umm...

M: yeah then he got up off the table
and she lied down on the table

F: oh she she she smacked his ass first (laughs)

M: oh yeah right

F: umm and then he got off the table
and she got on

M: yeah and he put some massage oil on his hands
and she took her towel off
he started massaging her

F: while she was lying on the table…
he took

M: yeah (laughs)

F: (laughs) she took her towel off yeah
and and she still looked like
she was enjoying things
more than he was…

M: and then he got mad at one point or something…

F: yeah

M: umm…and what did he do…

F: he retaliated
he smacked her butt

M: right

F: yeah and then she got off the table right

M: yeah

F: yeah

M: yeah and they both looked kind of mad at each other…and…

F: then it just looked like
they were having an argument for a while…

M: yeah

F: and then…

M: she was really upset with him
and he was being kind of defensive
and…trying to explain himself…
and finally he started accusing her
and then left the room

F: yeah oh she started crying too

M: oh yeah that's right…

F: and then yeah then he kind of got a little more
he he started to look like
he was sorry
for yelling at her
so he came back in
and it looked like
he sort of apologized
and then she kicked him
and then she left…

M: yeah…that's it

Subject Pair 4S

F: ok well there was a lady
and she was massaging the back of ahh
I'm assuming her husband or her lover of some sort

M: yeah obviously intimate

F: oh yeah very intimate he seemed rather uncomfortable in the beginning but
and she seemed to be enjoying herself just a little bit too much actually

M: but she was pretty gentle

F: yeah she was [quite gentle]

M: [y'know she was] nice to him
giving him a bit of a massage and into the head massage and on the back

F: and he started enjoying that yeah yeah
he really enjoyed that
and then it started getting a little bit more umm sexual
I think (laughs)

M: (laughs) well it was vigorous

F: yeah yeah

M: and then and then she gave him a a bit of a love tap [right on the butt]

F: [yeah yeah right] right and
obviously I think he was a little bit tired
and he wanted to give one to her now because

M: a massage

F: a massage yeah and…

M: so they switched

F: so they switched
and…she got all excited
and she got ready to get her massage and

M: that's right so she layed down
and she took off her towel
and put on a robe
I remember that umm
[he put some oil]…

F: [he put some oil] on his hands

M: on his hands

F: yeah and then he was a little bit more rough

M: yeah for sure

F: when he was giving her the massage
and it didn't last quite as long either (laughs)
because he gave her a little love tap
and he was a little bit

M: that was more than a love tap

F: yeah (laughs)

M: (laughs) ok so he whacked her
and she looked really upset

F: oh yeah

M: yeah

F: yeah and just started getting started getting really mad at her

M: that's true
so she looks really upset
and stares at him
and then they started arguing back and forth
he looked defensive in the beginning

F: yeah [yeah]

M: after that happened [he's] kind of like what y'know
he's got his hands out
going what what

F: I didn't do anything wrong
I'm just a male (laughs)

M: well…oh…anyways (laughs) right so umm then what happened after that…
so they start arguing
and she looks really upset
and he looks really upset oh no
he didn't look really upset
she looked really upset

F: she looked really
she looked hurt

M: she looked hurt and kind of like…[xxx]

F: [I can't] believe you did that and yeah

M: and then and then she starts to cry
I think
was the next thing that happened

F: no he started yelling at her

M: he started yelling at her first ok

F: he started yelling at her
and then she started to cry

M: right

F: really really really cry
and in the beginning he looked kind of sorry and apologetic
and then he just started yelling at [her even more]

M: [yeah he started] yelling at her again
as if he thought of something
no no no it's your fault your fault
then she sits down
I think…

F: umm…yep

M: yeah she sits down

F: she just started really really really really crying

M: lets it all go

F: yeah and then he left the room

M: he did leave the room…
and then you see him outside of the room
looking all guilty

F: guilty and

M: thinking about it

F: apologize

M: what have I done
then he comes back in

F: yeah and she's still crying
and she doesn't
and she stops crying
and she gets really…snobby look on her face…a look of defense
and and she kicks him

M: yeah he looks kind of sorry
and they're talking
and she gives him a whack

F: yeah kicked him really hard in the leg

M: yeah right in the leg

F: and then stormed out

M: that's true
did you did they storm out

F: no she stormed out

M: she stormed out hmm yep…
that's all I remember

Subject Pair 5S

F: ok well the clip starts out
with a woman massaging a man's back
and they're in a little massage room
it looks
like it's still in a house though

M: yeah a house and it looks
like she's doing his lower back
and they're talking back and forth
she's dressed in a towel he's dressed in a towel
and he says something no
he says something to her
or she says something to him (?)

F: well they're talking back and forth
and then it looks
like they know each other
it's not a professional massage
and so he says something
and she she's massaging not vigorously
but it's not like a nice relaxing massage
it looks
like they've worked out or something
or you know they had if
there's a purpose to the massage
and it's not romantic really
but it looks
like they are a romantic couple
and she he says something
that must cause a little bit of controversy
and she smacks his bottom not necessarily hard but enough to…

M: he looks a little surprised but
and she gives him a few more strokes on the back
and massages her fingers through his hair

F: yeah it's still a pleasant massage
it's still a nice massage
and he doesn't have a strong reaction to her smack on the bottom

M: no and then they switch places
he gets off the table
and puts on a bathrobe
and she sits down on the table

and unties the back of her towel

F: and she puts a towel around her hair

M: yes and towel around yes towel around her before she gets on the table
and then he puts a little bit of oil on his hands
and rubs them together
and then he starts massaging her back like a football player or something
I don't know

F: it's terrible
it's really it's awful
he sucks at giving massages
it looks like
and all I could think of
when he was massaging her back
it was just really fast and really not relaxing looking
and he just looked
like he had a purpose
as in to get her back for smacking his bum or something
because then he he smacked her back right away

M: mm-hmm

F: and it didn't look
like there was enough time
for [her to say something]

M: [and they're still talking] back and forth a little bit but not really……

F: so after that she got upset

M: yeah she got really upset
and she jumps off the table
and she's clinging to the towel
and they're yelling back and forth
I guess…

F: yeah and she she really got upset about that
and so she sat down
I think and…

M: well sitting down was later

F: was it later oh they were…

M: they were walking back and forth
and talking and

F: oh and they were getting really yeah
they were really upset both of them
well no he wasn't upset
she was upset

M: well he looked angry for a while…

F: yeah he looked angry at her
for getting so upset over that
and he had such a little reaction before but anyway then yeah
they're walking around and she…

M: then she starts to…
then she starts to look
like she's gonna cry
and he keeps yammering at her
and then eventually she breaks down
and she sits down
and she starts crying

F: and he was yelling at her
and then he went out into the hallway
I think for something

M: yeah he walked out for a bit

F: to get a break from her or whatever…

M: and then he just kinda paused
and thought about it for a bit
and then he went back into the room…

F: and they were yelling back and forth again

M: well [talking a little bit] more

F: [or they were just talking]

M: a little bit more but he looked
like he was being a little umm condescending…

F: yeah what a jerk
and then she kicked him in the shin (laughs)

and then stalked off

M: yep

F: it was really quite pathetic
they made her look terrible
and him he looked like a complete jerk
and she looked really wimpy

M: it looks like a fifty's movie to me

F: that's right…I think that's about it

Subject Pair 5S

F: ok started off with a woman giving a man a massage

M: and they were in a a room
that seemed like a hotel to me at first
but turned out to be
what looked like an apartment of theirs
and she was wearing a towel
and he was wearing a towel
and she seemed to be really enjoying sensuously
what she was doing…

F: and she spanked him

M: yeah

F: and then it was his turn
to give her a massage
but he did it a little rough
and he spanked her a little hard
and she got all upset
and started to fight…umm

M: umm yeah and there was lotsa lotsa angry faces
and he left the room just for a second
while they were fighting
came back in
and then she started to cry
sat down
he was talking to her
and [she kicked him] (laughs)

F: [she kicked him] (laughs)...mm
yeah then she got off the couch
and that was it

M: yeah... yeah I guess so

Subject Pair 7S

M: ok you should start

F: oh ok umm there was a woman and a man
and he was... [I think that's a]

M: [probably a married] couple

F: yeah yeah and and the I think that yeah
that was the first scene
he was lying on a table
and then you could see
the woman she was giving him a massage
and she was wearing a towel
and he was just getting a massage on the table umm
and they both seem pretty happy
they're they're [talking at first]

M: [mmm at first yeah]

F: yeah and ahh and ahh there was wit- there was umm curtains in the background so

M: yeah

F: you thought
that it might be umm

M: I thought it was a hotel [room at]

F: [a hotel room]

M: first but later on we figured out it was probably an apartment

F: yeah and then yeah we figured that
they were married
or they're a couple
and ahh and ahh while she was giving him a massage
and they were talking...

M: they were apparently having some sort of heated discussion

F: yeah but it wasn't
I don't think
either of them were mad yet
but umm then she finished giving him the massage
kind of slapped him
and then and then umm they switched places…umm

M: he started massaging her

F: yup…

M: and he didn't do a very good job

F: no he was he was pretty rough

M: yeah the discussion obviously got a little bit heated before that point

F: yeah and then so he was massaging her
and he was not being very nice about it
and then all of a sudden he slaps her
and she jumps up
and then it looks like
they started yelling
and and umm so then they started having this big argument…

M: about something

F: yeah…

M: and finally I guess…
well she started to cry eventually

F: yeah

M: and ahh…

F: oh and when they started arguing
that's when
we get like a better look at the room
cause they started walking around the room
and she they were both mad yknow
so we could kinda see
that it was it was probably a home or an apartment umm yeah
and then she she sat down on a couch

and started crying and umm…

M: he tried apologizing
and it wasn't good enough
so she kicked him

F: yeah oh he walked out first
and he looked like
he was he was gonna leave
and just leave her in the room
but then he came back
and it kind of looked like
he was apologizing or explaining
and and she stopped crying for a little bit
and looks up at him
and then and then she gave him this big kick…
and that was it

M: yeah not much more to it than that

Subject Pair 8S

F: ok so basically what happened is umm
there's a man and a woman
in what seemed to be like a hotel room or some kind of room
and first the lady was giving the man a back rub
using lotion and stuff like that and then…umm…

M: yeah they had towels on

F: right

M: yeah don't misunderstand
what the clip is about
and then he he she smacked him

F: right

M: on the on the butt
and then…they changed
and she got up
and he got on the table…
but he didn't…
well she was really vigorous
when she was massaging him
she was like y'know doing a good job

rubbed his temples and everything
and then when they changed

F: it seemed
like he wanted to just get this over and done with
and wasn't very caring
in the way he was massaging massaging her then
and then he slapped her on the butt
and then she didn't seem exactly pleased with that
so then she got up
and was really angry…

M: yeah and then they started fighting…
and…she at one point went into into the room
but before that they were just arguing for a really long time

F: yeah and he seemed kind of innocent
at what he was doing
he didn't really know
[why she was getting mad]

M: [yeah like why she was mad]…
but she got mad
and then she started to cry
and then he went into the room
cause he was still mad still got
still yelling at her
and then he went into the room…and

F: right he yeah he came back out
and I think
he felt bad
and he so he felt kind of guilty
for what he did
he wasn't being all defensive anymore…and then umm…

M: and then he ahh she kicked him

F: right in the leg [she kicked him in the leg]

M: [yeah cause she wasn't really upset]
she was faking crying
and he came to help her
and then I think
that's where the cartoon came in

F: that's good

Subject Pair 9S

F: it starts off
a man is giving his wife a massage…

M: we think
it's his wife

F: yeah right

M: we think
it's his wife

F: and I he she makes a comment…

M: no she first off she's giving him the massage

F: ok right

M: right and there's some sort of discourse going on between the two
and for some reason she decides to give him a slap on the ass

F: probably because he makes a rude comment or something

M: or something yeah…and umm he's a bit shocked a bit surprised
and there's a more a little bit more discourse going on
and then they switch spots

F: switch spots
it's her turn to get the massage…
and he puts oil on his hands
gets ready
just starts rubbing her down
and I think…
yeah they talk a bit

M: there's some more talk going on
and then he hits
he slaps her…

F: pretty hard…

M: obviously harder than she slapped him
and she gets and she all she gets obviously…

F: peeved

M: peeved about it yeah…and then there's some more discourse going on…

F: but that's it for the massaging
she gets up after that slap
and she's really mad
it seems

M: yeah

F: and then they looks like
they're arguing back and forth…and for quite some time…
and then she starts to cry

M: then she starts crying
and he continues to berate her
and point his finger at her
and carry on
and walks out of the room

F: yeah and she's crying and crying
then he's thinking out outside of the room
he's thinking hmm
I probably did
I didn't say that right
or feeling remorseful

M: yeah and so he comes out of the room
and it appears as though
he's trying to reconcile ahh
hard to say
but he's trying to reconcile…
and umm there doesn't seem to be any like ahh what's the like resolution or whatever
and then the cartoon came up

F: and that was it

Subject Pair 10S

M: so there's a couple
giving a massage…

F: yeah the first the guy was laying on the table…

M: yeah and then they take turns
so the wife gets on the table…

F: well we assume
she's a wife

M: yeah we're assuming we
at first we didn't know

F: the lady

M: there you go…
and then umm they start into an argument

F: yeah well they seem happy to start with
she's giving a massage
she smacks him…and…

M: then when he's giving her the massage
he smacks her

F: yeah and that starts sort of the umm…

M: argument it seems
like they're bickering
we concluded
or that they were bickering about expenses…and then so…

F: but and they went through sort of different stages
they they kind of well we talked about the happy
and then they kind of got more into it
and and were pointing fingers at each other and

M: we see the tears and the frustration…

F: and she yeah she down right sobbed

M: yeah and we see him taking

F: he got a little bit angry
didn't he like

M: he got angry
and then he really felt
that he did something wrong

F: he walked out of the room
and I think had time to think about it
[and came back]

M: [yeah he was contemplating what]
what her feelings were
what he had done to her

F: and she had lots of pent up feelings
and so she kicked him…

M: suffered violence

F: yeah and that's kinda where
it ended hunh?

M: that's about it